THE CROZER QUARTERLY

January, 1943

BUT WHAT ABOUT THE LAYMAN?	*Robert Munson Grey*	3
THE CLASSICS AND THE BIBLE	*William K. Prentice*	12
GOD AND HISTORY	*George W. Davis*	18
AN INTRODUCTION TO KIERKEGAARD	*George E. Levy*	37
THE AUTHORSHIP RACKET	*Mitchell Bronk*	46
JEREMIAH AND WAR	*J. Philip Hyatt*	52
WHERE IGNORANCE IS BLISS, 'TIS FOLLY		59
FROM OFF THE CAMPUS AND ON		61
BOOK REVIEWS		63
BOOK NOTICES		80
BOOKS RECEIVED		87

...e XX Number 1

330352

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Published by
Crozer Theological Seminary
Chester, Pennsylvania

MORTON S. ENSLIN, Editor
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, Business Manager

The policy of the CROZER QUARTERLY is to present investigations, discussions, and reviews in the field of religion which will prove of value and interest to the professional student of religion and to the layman.

Manuscripts, books for review, and communications for the editor should be addressed
Editor of the CROZER QUARTERLY
Chester, Pennsylvania
Business communications and subscriptions should be addressed
Business Manager of the CROZER QUARTERLY
Chester, Pennsylvania

Issued Quarterly $1.50 a year Single Numbers, 40 cents

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Copyright, 1942, by Crozer Theological Seminary. All rights reserved.

THE JUDSON PRESS PRINTED IN U.S.A.

THE CROZER QUARTERLY
Vol. XX JANUARY, 1943 No. 1

BUT WHAT ABOUT THE LAYMAN?

ROBERT MUNSON GREY
The First Church in Woburn, Massachusetts

HAVING READ "The Layman Observes the Minister," by Dr. A. C. Reid, the pastor drops his July number of the CROZER QUARTERLY with a sigh. If you hear it, do not suppose that his sighing betrays impatience. He does not resent observation; it would be his pleasure to mark any enlargement of that company which can find in him or his work an object of interest. But he feels that those who inspect him, especially when they do it for purposes of publicity, should keep both eyes open. Concerning the brisk currying which the ministry receives at the hand of Dr. Reid he thinks: There is truth here, certainly; but, is it not of the sort which comes by casual observation rather than the whole truth which can be gained only through close examination? Was not the writer so completely engaged in criticism of surface features that he missed some conditioning factors which lie beneath?

There follows another sigh, wholly wistful, for now the pastor is thinking: Though Dr. Reid may be overzealous to make me a scapegoat for the guilt of the whole church, he nonetheless understands what Christians ought to be doing in the world, and he reveals himself, moreover, as one who seems to be fit and willing to do his full share. If there were more laymen of his calibre and spirit, there would be more ministers capable of leading that kind of layman.

Primarily this reflection is intended neither as a compliment to Dr. Reid nor as a merely partisan defense of the ministry. It is a thesis held by one who for some years has dwelt on the religious scene, experiencing in succession the church life of layman and minister. It is the purpose of this article to establish the thesis that laymen are deeply implicated in the deficiencies of the ministerial office.

I

We shall begin by thinking about the church, of which ministers and laymen are complementary parts.

The church exists for a purpose. It has been charged with a special mission to the world. God has given it a truth to speak and a work to do. This truth should be mankind's most urgent intellectual concern, for it is the truth about man himself in his relations with the universe. The work

is the most important ever entrusted to an institution, its purpose being nothing less than the redemption of all individuals and the transformation of natural human society into the kingdom of God. Responsibility for the discharge of her mission of truth and task rests upon the church as a whole. When St. Peter called the Christian community "a royal priesthood," he had in mind, I believe, that all the functions of the church are a common endowment and that they constitute a common trust, the administration of which must always be a matter of common concern. He is as right in the twentieth as he was in the first century.

Now, if any part of this common trust be delegated to individuals, it is incumbent upon the entire company to insure that the chosen trustees be fit persons; else must the body as a whole bear the consequences of failure. For it is true ethically as well as legally that, while functions may be delegated, primary responsibilities may not be. A nurse, trusted to administer medicine at critical times, may feel inclined to sleep, and may indulge her feelings, leaving bottle and spoon in the hands of a housemaid; but if serious consequences be suffered by the patient, it is the nurse, not the housemaid, who bears the guilt. Only the doctor who originally enjoined her with responsibility could have absolved the nurse, and that only before she had delegated her function. This principle holds with respect to a corporate entity like the church. The group is chargeable with the acts and omissions of its agents. Should the minister, as agent of the church, through ignorance or cowardice fail to speak the truth, that truth still holds its right to be spoken. Should he for any reason be remiss concerning those courageous acts necessary to the transformation of society, the acts do not cease to be an obligation. In all cases of default, responsibility for having the word spoken and the act done reverts to the corporate entity upon which it was first placed, namely, the conscience of the whole church. I believe that God has thus charged the church with its mission of truth and task, and I do not know of any occasion when he absolved it of its primary responsibility and advised it to let the proclamation of its gospel or the performance of its work hang upon the virtues and energies of a separated class.

It seems that Dr. Reid does not recognize this principle of joint accountability. In several places he mentions the failure of the church. But his context in each instance identifies "church" with "ministry." In no case does he implicate the laity. I protest. My lay brethren may leave me to stand alone in the church; I refuse to appear in court without them. We must face the indictment together. It will give me no little comfort to have so good a man as Dr. Reid with me.

Let me say it, then, without delay: We Christians, lay and cleric, have, in certain respects failed sadly, shamefully. Many, perhaps most, of us have lost that sense of urgency which once made our religion the noblest

concern of spiritual men. We have mislaid, forgotten, or neglected the central truths of our gospel. Certainly the church betrays no burning sense of a message which must be spoken to a mad world. Our Christian men and women have scant awareness of being charged with a work for the redemption of society which they can neglect only at peril to their souls. Even the tottering of our civilization moves us but little. The imperative has been dropped from truth and task, and I find the laity no more eager than the ministry to recover it. Moreover, there is no hope that one can recover it without the aid of the other. In a sense the ministry is the executive hand of the church, but why scold the hand for trembling when the brain is uncertain and the body palsied?

II

Look more closely at the minister. He is an instructive if not always a noble exhibit.

Many laymen seem to believe that a good minister is the fruit of a special creative act, a gift which God sends to his church through channels uncontaminated by the flow of ordinary humanity. They are mistaken. God does not fashion ministers *de novo* nor shape them of some refined spiritual essence in regions beyond the earth. He calls from the midst of humanity the product of home and church to be his prophets and priests. Consequently the spiritual qualities required of a good minister must first exist in the Christian community. I believe it to be true that a man's mature ministry in the pulpit is the echo of his youthful spiritual experience. College may enlarge his mind, the seminary clarify his understanding of Christian doctrine, and years of reading deepen his general culture, but whatever he has of integrity and enthusiasm will be found to antedate his experience of school and books. They are, like his courage, if he have it, primary qualities of personality. Show me a man fearless in speaking the truth, generous toward his fellows, and eager in acceptance of his duties toward social need, and I will say of him that his childhood was spent in an environment which begat and encouraged these qualities. From his pulpit he utters with individual accent what first he heard in home and church. The marks of parents, teachers, deacons, godly men and women are on his soul. The fire that lights and warms his ministry was kindled at the hearth. The adult world which he knew in childhood had, to use a Quaker expression, a "concern" for him and society which formed his spirit. I think at the moment of such a man. He sometimes tells of his leadings toward the ministry. As a child he often saw his father, a deacon in the church, prepare the bread for the Lord's supper. It was a loaf specially baked for the Sacrament. On Sunday morning, after doing his chores, the father bathed and dressed, putting on clothes kept for the Sabbath day.

Then, on a table newly scrubbed, with a knife never used for another purpose, he cut the dedicated loaf, his hand reluctant to touch the sacred fragments, on his austere face a serene and holy light. It is not strange that the son of such a father should become "a good minister of Jesus Christ." Nor should we be surprised if, with so few of his kind of home in our church constituency, we fail to produce in sufficient number the kind of minister which the better sort of laymen longs to see. Let the laymen who demand better ministers take this truth to heart.

When, therefore, Dr. Reid finds the ordained spokesman of religion deficient in courage, uncertain in direction, and feeble in the utterance of God's will, he should look for the cause in the many "Christian" homes that are as spiritually impersonal as boardinghouses and in the churches that are as wanting in concern for the redemption of society as are the country club and the open highway which lure church members from the worship of God.

The church is the mother of the ministry. She brings forth after her kind. If, then, she is incapable of passing along the genes and hormones which make men in the heroic mould, is she justified in repudiating her puny offspring? Where she is deficient in the earnestness, courage, grace, and sacrificial spirit which can make her sons fit for the tasks that are properly hers as well as theirs, can she justly complain if those sons leave unchallenged in her what she has not sufficiently encouraged in them? The problem of the ministry is largely one of prenatal care. Robust ministers are not produced in secular homes and churches. They are the fruits of spiritual travail.

My last three paragraphs may have little relevance as a defense of the ministry; I hope they are not without significance for the Christian community. They were written by one who remembers how much a presence in the home, and a spirit in the church, of his childhood have contributed to anything in his ministry that is worthy of the Lord's household. Let laymen cherish the spiritual health of home and church; then will they have reason to boast of their ministry.

III

Dr. Reid charges that many ministers are intellectually feeble. To be sure, they are. But many, also, are strong. Most of the latter, I take it, are strangers to Dr. Reid. And here is the reason. Certain of our larger congregations in every denomination are intelligent enough to seek intelligence in their pastors. Usually they get it. The pastors of such churches become prominent partly because of their positions and partly because of their native gifts. Dr. Reid cannot help knowing and admiring such conspicuous ministers. Other prominent churches, and they are a large group, are

frightened by the uses of the intellect. They are made uncomfortable by men in the pulpit who ask them to think. Their desire is for entertainment rather than instruction. They are content with the preacher whose mind is just keen enough to detect and confirm their prejudices and whose vocabulary is sufficiently unctuous to invest their secular interests with a pseudo-sacred character. These men, too, come under Dr. Reid's observation. Upon them his lash falls, and justly. But there is a third type of church which can exercise little choice in the calling of a pastor. It must take what is available. Frequently it gets by accident an intellectual man whom the first type of church does not need because it already has one like him and whom the second type sedulously avoids. There are, thank God, many of these faithful men in little churches. Some of the best minds and largest spirits that I know are in obscure positions where Dr. Reid will never see them except by chance.

While we are on the subject of intelligence let us make sure that we understand the situation of the minister. Here is a recent seminary graduate, prepared for the ministry by seven years' work in college and graduate school. It is more than likely that he is an empiricist, seeking God. He knows that if he is to find a God whom his soul can trust and whose truth he can preach with conviction, he must seek him in the welter of modern life. God must be his contemporary. But when this young man attempts to lead a Christian congregation down the venturesome way which he treads in search of that God, he finds few who will follow him through the confused relations of modern society. They want to hear about a god who anciently dwelt between the cherubim and smote with death the unrighteous man who touched the ark of his presence. That our God may sit lonely in the slums or stand unseen on the thresholds of European chancelleries, waiting to catch the ear of the world with a word more relevant for our day than any word of the ancient prophets, the great mass of church members will not believe. It is an appalling fact that religion has little contemporary meaning for men and women who have brought every other relation of their lives up to the present moment. To see the human world and human relations as they appear under the eye of true religion is always disquieting, sometimes terrifying. It is more than a secular church can bear.

Not long ago I took part in the examination of a candidate for the Christian ministry. The examining council was composed of an equal number of laymen and ministers. After the candidate had read a paper which revealed little of his mind, the council members were permitted to ask questions. None of the lay members exercised their privilege. Half a dozen of the ministers who share Dr. Reid's concern for an able ministry tried to discover what, if anything, the young man believed. He seemed

to hold some convictions about a god who had been fairly active back in Old Testament times; about New Testament days he was not so sure, but he suggested tentatively that something of a divine or semidivine potency hovered about the personality of Jesus. The ministers wanted some assurance that God had not wholly withdrawn from the world. One of them put the question: "If someone should come to you asking for evidence of God's activity in the world today, what would be your answer?" The candidate avowed that if the inquirer was not satisfied to know that God had appeared to Moses in the mount it would be useless to talk to him. Another minister, trying to clarify and press the point, asked whether the candidate could see the judgments of God in history and especially in the present war. The young man was unwilling to risk his god in the stream of history. But he was sure that some deity had punished Israel for her sins.

This recital is merely introductory to what happened afterwards. The candidate was excused from the room, and the council was left to decide whether he ought to be ordained. Then, though the young man had been treated with flawless courtesy, a layman arose and chastised the ministers for having bedeviled a fine Christian lad with "a lot of silly questions." Other laymen supported their volunteer spokesman. I am afraid that Dr. Reid will get to know this newly made minister and I equally fear that he may never meet the intelligent young seminarian who is in search of a contemporary God. For I know my lay brethren. They will surely advance the one and damn the other to obscurity.

Intelligence in the church involves apprehending, quite as much as it involves speaking, the truth. Recently, having been invited to address a group of ministers, I chose to spend the time in discussing "preacher problems." I asked the men what they had found to be their greatest sermonic difficulty. They confessed unanimously that their hardest task was to find points of contact with the minds of their people. Congregations, these ministers averred, do not read along, much less independently explore, lines of contemporary Christian thought. They present to the preacher little of what the old-fashioned psychologist called "the apperceiving mass." Consequently, that which the minister most desires to say they are least eager to hear, least able to understand. Ministers must count on having in their congregations a large percentage of men and women whose minds are cluttered with the week's offering of sporting and fashion pages, of financial column, radio programs, neighborhood gossip, and stories told in the commuters' train. What are the chances of insinuating timely fragments of eternal truth into such a mass? or what hope that, if anything of spiritual value passes through the ear, it will intrigue the intellect and challenge the will? To be sure, we need brave tongues to speak the truth, but not less do we need minds fearless to receive and act upon it; minds truly prepared

by independent thinking to receive the searching principles of the Christian gospel and alert to the difficult tasks which Christ enjoined upon his church. I suspect that many intelligent ministers, in despair of being heard by such minds, tear up in the study fully as many sermons as they preach. But those ministers keep good company. They may shake their heads ruefully over their congregations and say with St. Paul, "I have fed you as babes with milk and not with meat, for you were not able to bear it."

One feels pain for Dr. Reid who listens to so few sermons that measure to his standards; the more so because there is little hope of his faring better. For, when next the pulpit is vacant, Dr. Reid's lay brethren will surely call to their pastorate a jolly man, a good mixer whose hands are equally adept at tousling young heads and patting older backs. It may almost be taken for granted that the new pastor will be someone whom the president of the savings bank or the proprietor of the local iron works will have heard with satisfaction at a luncheon of the Kiwanis Club, since it has long been established in the lay mind that clever after-dinner speakers have precisely that amount of spiritual insight which insures the kind of sermon best suited to the religious needs of the businessman. Certainly the church will call a young pastor, because the layman of affairs who has grown old in commerce, industry, or finance and who knows that the enterprise to which he has given his life would pile upon the rocks should his experienced hand drop from the helm, also knows, as by an infallible intuition, that God can make no use of a minister guilty of passing his forty-ninth birthday. Dr. Reid may demand of his minister the wisdom and poise which come only with long experience, but by choice of his fellows in the pew he will have to suffer the inadequacies of youth in the pulpit.

Let laymen remember their responsibilities toward the ministry, seeing that in many of our large denominations the laity alone have the power to call the pastor. It is they who make or break the preacher. Therefore, were I to write a penitential office for the exclusive use of my lay brethren, I would surely incorporate this acknowledgment of guilt: We have broken those ministers whom we ought not to have broken and have left unbroken those whom we ought to have broken, and there is no intelligence in us.

IV

Dr. Reid judges that ministers are cowardly. He observes that they do not lead their people in those good works which properly belong to the Christian church—as if the people were eager to be led! This is a most naïve criticism. I did not suppose that any man who knows the church from the inside could offer it. Surely Dr. Reid is an outsider, else would he know that church people in general have no desire to disturb the established order and that they hate with a special bitterness the minister who betrays

an interest in the reconstruction of society on the lines of righteousness and justice prescribed by Jesus. Our people like to think of religion as the strongest bulwark of things as they are. Men do not attend church in hope of being shown how to correct the evils of society: they come to relax in a reassuring atmosphere so that they may go back into the world better able to turn existing conditions to their own profit. I know this because countless laymen have told me that they will not listen to a man who chooses to dump social, political, or international problems in their laps on Sunday morning. They seek rest in the house of God. That the church has a God-given obligation to minister to a sick world they will not admit. It is their contention that religion should confine its activities within the limits set for private conscience. If an individual steals or commits murder, the church ought to arraign him; when society does these things on the grand scale, the pulpit must show no interest. So the people reason. Now and again some laymen who dimly see the relevance of Jesus' teaching to the spiritual life of both individual and society will say to me, "You, being a minister, may safely take an academic interest in these matters, as long as you keep them out of the pulpit." That much latitude they grant me. But they add, "Do not forget that we laymen, who must live in the world, cannot afford to tamper with its mechanisms, no matter how faulty they may be."

I cannot understand how Dr. Reid can remain ignorant of the chasm which opens between pulpit and pew where both confront our sadly maladjusted society. I know some, but not many, laymen who have suffered in discharge of their Christian duty toward the social and economic order. I know, too, of ministers who have suffered cruelly, and of many more who constantly stand in jeopardy because they try to widen the area of their people's private consciences so that the church may come to see and welcome those hard tasks upon the doing of which the reconstruction of the world depends. It is a pity that laymen of broad mind and good heart should not know how many of these ministers there are.

Dr. Reid says that "God never calls a fool to the ministry." One hesitates to shatter this perfect epigram; but the deed must be done. For the truth is that God never calls any but fools. There are prudent men in the pulpit; preachers whose worldly wisdom can calculate nicely how much of Christ's truth will be acceptable to the congregation and whose sense of self-preservation applies the brake well short of the danger line. But these are not ministers by divine vocation. Hardly can they be called more than jovial and efficient secretaries of social clubs that meet under Gothic roofs between walls that shut out the preventable woes of our human order. When God wants a servant who will stand up to the world he calls the inspired "fool of Christ" who has never developed a prudential regard for his personal safety and interests. And, he usually finds such men in the

homes of the naïve Christian laity where a divine dissatisfaction with the world as it is combines with a simplicity, Christlike and fearless, to create an atmosphere where the soul can grow to its full stature.

I am aware that a harsh tone pervades much of what I have written. Let me, therefore, introduce another note whose softness will speak more adequately of my own experience with the laity. There are churches, many of them, thank God, where intelligence and integrity form a strong bond between pulpit and pew. If Dr. Reid, or any disaffected layman, desires to see such a happy union, he will be well advised to look for it among churches which have retained their pastors for ten years or more, because this compatability comes only through long association. Granted that a minister of good intelligence and sound conscience enters upon a pastorate with a purpose to speak the whole truth in love, and granted that he holds to his resolution firmly, he may expect that some years of straight preaching will either convert, or discourage the attendance of, those parishioners who are wholly selfish and unchristian, so that there will be left under his ministry few but those who will listen to "the foolishness of preaching" with respect and gladness. His church may be made smaller by honesty and enthusiasm in the pulpit, but it will be a church which knows that, not to the preacher only, but to the whole Christian community God has committed the ministry of truth and task. I salute all churches of this high order! They are God's "remnant" in whose faithfulness lies the hope of any better world which humanity may be able to achieve. I trust Dr. Reid may live to find happy fellowship in one of them.

THE CLASSICS AND THE BIBLE

WILLIAM K. PRENTICE

Princeton University

Few of us, even when we have studied Greek or Latin for several years, have much appreciation of the value which the "classical" literature could have for us, or suspect that there is great pleasure to be had in reading these ancient books. I suppose this is chiefly because few of us ever read enough of this literature at any one time to know what it really is. There are only two ways to appreciate and enjoy a foreign literature: one is to learn its language and then to read it in its original form without translating it at all, the other is to read it in translations. If anyone of us is unable to read a foreign book in the original without laboriously translating it into his own language for himself, line by line, it is far better for him to read an English translation of that book made by someone who knows its language thoroughly. Then he could read all of that book, or large parts of it, as he reads an English book, and understand and enjoy it accordingly.

Few in this country ever learn Greek or Latin so that they can read it without translating it, for the only way in which anybody ever learns a foreign language is by using it. It would not be very difficult for us to learn Greek or Latin, but we are not taught in that way here. Consequently, when most of us try to read any of the Greek or Latin literature in the original, our attention is absorbed in the rather useless business of finding English equivalents for the individual Greek or Latin words, and then arranging these equivalents in English sentences of some sort. That is not really "reading the classical literature in the original," as many assert: it is merely trying to worry the original over into English in order to understand it. Furthermore, those who teach the classical literatures often devote too much attention to the vocabulary of each, its grammar and syntax, its literary techniques, and certain not very important details of the life and customs of its time. How can we appreciate or enjoy any literature when we study it in that fashion?

Another reason for our lack of enjoyment in reading the classics is the common belief that they are rather dull stuff anyway, and not very valuable to our present age. Of course this is partly because most of us do not know very much about them. Partly, however, it is because these ancient books are often presented to us with certain presumptions, which may have been justifiable once, long ago, but which are certainly not true for us now. For example, we are often taught to regard the classical literature, especially the ancient Greek literature, as artistically superior to any other literature, and as having a certain degree of authority. We are often taught that the Homeric poems are essentially historical; that the

works of historians such as Herodotus, Thucydides, Diodorus, and Plutarch are authoritative histories; that the statements and implications in the speeches of Demosthenes and the other orators are accurate and unbiased; that the *Dialogues* of Plato record actual conversations between the real Socrates and his friends. The result is that the ancient Greeks, and to some extent the ancient Romans, seem to us unreal persons, their life quite different from human life as we know it. The facts are that Homer is poetry, not history; that the ancient histories are not histories for us but sources from which, with much else besides, we are now able to construct modern histories of the ancient world; and that Plato's *Dialogues* contain Plato's own ideas presented in the form of imaginary conversations between an ideal Socrates and certain others, all of whom are at least partly imaginary. A good deal of the classical literature is not at all what its surface indicates, or what many still assume it to be.

A German professor, famous in his time, said to his students: "There is no reader, from the boy to the old man, who would not find the greatest pleasure in the grace, the simplicity, the fidelity to nature, and the loveliness of the *Odyssey*." He said much the same thing also about the *Iliad*, some parts of which contain rather stronger meat than anything in the *Odyssey*. And this is still true, as anyone will discover for himself who reads these poems in the translations of Andrew Lang. Of course, anyone who cannot read Latin or Greek must forego most of the enjoyment of the classical lyrics. For when a translation of a lyric poem is at all comparable to the original, it is commonly a new poem by its own right. However, there's a great deal of enjoyment, and of profit, to be had in reading *Greek Poets in English Verse*, edited by W. H. Appleton in 1893: the translations are by various persons, some of whom are famous as poets themselves. Anyone who reads a translation of Herodotus will enjoy the many anecdotes he tells, and the information he gives about strange peoples and their customs. In their literary charm some of these anecdotes are comparable to those very dramatic stories contained in I and II Kings. The reader will enjoy still more the main body of Herodotus' book, which tells of the courage and heroism of the Greeks in their struggles with the Persians. Thucydides' history of the Peloponnesian war, though it is chiefly a military history of a war, is one of the great books of the world. It contains some of the most powerful descriptions, such as the account of the plague at Athens, of the siege of Platæa, the revolutions of Corcyra, the last battle in the harbor of Syracuse. One will get far more out of it by reading all of it in a translation, than by translating parts of it slowly for himself. No one can fail to admire the objectivity of its author, and the almost complete absence of prejudice and personal bias from the whole narrative. As for Demosthenes, however much one may condemn his personal faults or discredit some of his state-

ments, the flaming patriotism of the man and his eloquence will impress everyone. No educated man should fail to read the *Crito* and the *Phædo* of Plato, and at least some parts of Plato's other *Dialogues.* If, in similar ways, I should speak here of the Latin literature, I would choose first Virgil and Cicero and Seneca's letters: Horace, being chiefly a lyric poet, cannot be fully appreciated except in the original.

But I think that most of us would enjoy the Greek drama most of all, especially those plays which are called "tragedies." They lose a good deal in translations, of course. Often the translations are inadequate because the translators do not always understand the original, or do not judge correctly the characters and situations, or fail to visualize the plays as they would be performed on the stage. To appreciate any play in reading it one must visualize the scenes by one's imagination. Sometimes it is very hard for any modern person to understand an ancient play, because he does not know what people were thinking and talking about, for example, in Athens, when the play was written: that is particularly true of Euripides' *Bacchæ.* But nonetheless, by and large, the ancient Athenian tragedies, in translations which can be read as we read an English play, make very pleasant and profitable reading for anyone: they are deeply moving; they kindle our imagination; they deal with some of the most important spiritual problems, experiences, and aspirations of mankind; and they compel us to think on such things. They are far more profound than Shakespeare's plays, and, to me at least, not less true in their reflection of the basic passions and motives of mankind.

Æschylus' *Prometheus* has been a good deal talked about and quoted from, not only in ancient times, but by very modern people, too. With good reason it has been called "the most profoundly moving drama of all literature." Through its treatment of certain, rather primitive, legends it presents in dramatic form the development of man's faulty conceptions of God. In that respect it is a good deal like the Book of Job, but like Job it is not easily understood if one considers only the surface. A good many of its verses, moreover, are very beautiful and quotable. The great trilogy of Æschylus, consisting of three plays, the *Agamemnon,* the *Choëphori* and the *Eumenides,* connected by their central theme, the curse on the house of Atreus, contains some of the most dramatic episodes and most spectacular scenes. Through it all shines the poet's effort to understand the nature and the justice of God, "who has set this law to be supreme that wisdom comes by suffering." The *Œdipus Tyrannus* is doubtless the best of all the plays of Sophocles. In it is portrayed the greatest character in Greek fiction. He is very human, and like the rest of us has his faults; but always, with immense courage and self-abnegation, he has sacrificed himself for what he believed to be the good of others. Innocent himself of anything which

we would call great sin, in the end he is completely crushed; but by his suffering his people are redeemed. The play of Sophocles which I, personally, like the best is called the *Philoctetes*. The hero, Neoptolemus, a young man just emerging from boyhood, is amazingly modern in his character. At the beginning of the play his character seems entirely unformed: he has never been tried. Under the influence of an older man whom he very much respects and admires he is persuaded to undertake a task which he believes to be dishonorable, namely, to get from the suffering Philoctetes by deceit and treachery the bow which never misses. It is a difficult and dangerous task. At first he is intoxicated by his success; then he comes to himself, and recognizes the significance and the consequences of his act. He proposes to restore the bow to its owner. At that moment the older man, who at the time is the most powerful fighter in all the world, orders this untried soldier to give the bow to him. But the boy refuses: he has become a man.

Perhaps the most attractive of all the Greek tragedies is Euripedes' *Alcestis*. Here, too, an unformed character is developed in strength and in depth by a succession of shattering experiences, all of which appear to have taken place within the limits of a single day. Yet the reformation of the man seems to be complete and genuine. A young king is promised that his life will be prolonged if he can find someone to die in his place. His own wife consents to make this sacrifice, and he accepts. But when death comes to her, he realizes his selfishness and cowardice, and ultimately she is miraculously restored to him. Many object to the *Alcestis* because they feel that it is based upon an impossible and childish story: such things simply do not happen in real life. There is a story written rather recently, about a young American professor and his wife. They were very poor. He was absorbed in some research by which he hoped to obtain a better position and better support for his family. But his wife became ill. The doctor said she must go away, and he felt that she could not go unless he abandoned his work, left the university, and went with her. Twice she refused to leave; finally he decided that they must go. Then the doctor told him that it was too late. However, the man gave up his work and took his wife away, and contrary to all expectation she recovered, and ultimately he succeeded in his profession. That seems to me essentially the story of the *Alcestis*. Here, as commonly in the Greek drama, the poet has used an ancient legend as the outward frame within which he constructs his own plot and scenes and characters.

These brief comments and examples may suggest something of the value which the classical literature has for all of us nowadays. Only, to appreciate and enjoy it one must read it for one's self, as one reads books in one's own language, and must read it without prejudice or prepossessions.

Much of what is said here has a bearing also on our reading of the Bible. Few of us attempt to read the Bible in its original languages, and consequently we are not disturbed by the effort to translate it into English for ourselves. But most of us are very much affected by traditions and beliefs about the Bible, which prevent us from understanding it and deriving from it the knowledge which it affords. Belief properly begins where knowledge leaves off, and we *know* a good deal about the Bible now. For example, many believe that every book in the Bible was written by the author whose name it bears, and at the time to which tradition assigns it. Thus we attribute all of "Isaiah" to the prophet of that name, although it is clear that chapters 40-55 were composed about two hundred years later than chapters 1-39, and it is probable that chapters 56-66 are later still. Evidently some copyist unwisely transcribed chapters 40-66 in a manuscript which already contained chapters 1-39. Many consider the gospels to be the personal recollections of men who were intimately associated with Jesus, or who received their narratives from those who were intimately associated with him. Many accept all of the epistles as really written by those whose names are attached to them, and so accept all of them as reflecting the ideas and practices of an apostolic church.

In one important respect our difficulties in understanding the Bible are due to our unfamiliarity with certain differences in attitude and custom between ancient writers and ourselves, which are apparent in every ancient literature. There was no such critical judgment of sources in antiquity as there is now: stories were accepted as true on grounds which today would seem entirely insufficient. Moreover, there was no such conscientious respect for authorship then as now. Many ancient books have been ascribed to persons who had nothing whatever to do with their composition, as modern scholars have proved in a good many instances. Sometimes an ancient author, for reasons which we cannot always determine, wrote in the name of some other person, who may have lived long before his own time. Because these facts are not fully appreciated, many of us think it quite impossible that the "First Epistle of Paul to Timothy" was written perhaps as much as a century after Paul's death. Does not this epistle begin with the words "Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ . . . unto Timothy, my own son in the faith"? There is nothing really strange about this. We have many ancient letters which are now recognized as spurious, such as some of the letters of Plato, or the letters of Alexander the Great, not to mention the *Letters* of Phalaris, which were entirely discredited by Bentley, although before Bentley's time they were a common schoolbook. We all know that Plato's *Dialogues,* in spite of their introductions, are not genuine conversations between Socrates and his friends, although biographies of Socrates used to be written largely on the basis of these dialogues. Even in our own

time we have examples of the same sort of thing, for our bookstores are flooded with "historical" novels and popular biographies in which words never spoken are put in the mouths of historical persons, and purely imaginary situations are presented as real. This practice is certainly open to criticism. But we do not regard such authors as dishonest: we understand that they were using certain literary forms to express their own ideas, or to convey their own conceptions of actual characters, circumstances, and events.

The Bible is a collection of ancient writings, and these are very much like other ancient writings. By a knowledge of other ancient literatures we can understand the biblical literature better, and thus we can learn from it more perfectly about Jesus Christ and his teaching.

GOD AND HISTORY

GEORGE W. DAVIS

Crozer Theological Seminary

GOD AND HISTORY—surely no topic enjoys wider current interest. Living in world-shaking days of transition, when an excessively sensate culture has plunged them into chaos, men can scarcely fail to think of history. If, in addition, they have faith in a God who rules the ultimate destinies of the universe, they would be unworthy unless some question about the relation of God to the tragic events of our generation arose within their minds.

Yet I approach this task of determining the relation of God and history with fear and misgiving. Even the minds of the great have failed to find much significance in the ceaseless onrush of historic event. Long ago Marcus Aurelius, finding no progress whatsoever in history, wrote, "Everything now is just as it was in the time of those whom we have buried.[1] He finds the present pageant of history to be exactly the same as its past drama. All that differs is the actors. That genius of historical portrayal, Edward Gibbon, after saying that the reign of the two Antonines, who ruled Rome 138-180 A.D., was "possibly the only period of history in which the happiness of a great people was the sole object of government," goes on to say of the older, Titus Antoninus Pius, "his reign is marked by the rare advantage of furnishing very few materials for history; which is, indeed, little more than the register of the crimes, follies, and misfortunes, of mankind."[2] And Goethe, in his *Faust,* likens history to the book with seven seals about which we read in Rev. 5 : 1-3. "Listen, my friend," Faust says to Wagner, "the ages that are past are now a book with seven seals protected."[3] History, contends Goethe, is a mystery so tightly sealed that none can read its meaning.

However pessimistic these and similar statements concerning history may sound, I take heart from the conviction of the poet Tennyson that "thro' the ages one increasing purpose runs"[4] and launch out into the deep.

The Bible and History

Christian ideas have their root in the Scriptures of Judaism and in those of the early Christian community. Surveying these, one quickly discovers that the Bible is not alone a book containing history, but a philosophy of history as well. The latter is what interests us.

The biblical philosophy of history is one which intimately associates God with earthly events. For the ancient Hebrew, and likewise for the

[1] Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations,* ix, 14.
[2] Edward Gibbon, *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,* Book I, Chap. 3.
[3] *Faust,* Part I, lines 575 f.
[4] *Locksley Hall,* line 137.

early Christian, historic events do not just happen. They are done by God. His hand is active in the press and throng of historic movement. This mood is strongly expressed in the book of Daniel, the prophecies of Jeremiah, and the general Hebrew view of God's activity in the life of Israel. God is present, wielding effective power to move life onwards to a culminating event. For the Jew history was no movement through recurrent cycles, as it was for the ancient Greek and Roman; it was rather progress towards a world-shaking consummation. God was in the process, giving dynamic direction to events. Whereas our historians would write, "George Washington defeated Cornwallis at Yorktown," or, "Abraham Lincoln freed the slaves," the men of ancient Israel would exclaim, "God led us up out of Egypt and delivered us from Pharaoh's hands,"[5] or, "The Lord your God hath delivered them into your hand."[6]

Such is the biblical philosophy of history, never separating God from the world nor the events of history, but interpreting the world as his act in creation and history as his action in time. The God of the Bible is a working, toiling God. In this respect, his character is well expressed in words attributed to Jesus: "My Father worketh even until now."[7] Somehow, the purpose of God runs through the maze of events, causing even the folly and failures of men to praise him. There is a slow but sure working towards the full realization of the goal which God has in mind. While we may sometimes feel that the men of the Bible were mistaken in their interpretation of the action of God, may it not yet be true that they were right in their point of view? Is history merely a series of events, more or less connected, or is it the scene of God's action wherein he seeks to realize his purpose with the race? God is either the Lord of history, toiling within the historic process, or else he is a nonentity or a deistically conceived deity who for millennia has given no thought to earth's toiling, creating, suffering billions. Certainly the faith of the Bible is the former. God acts in history: in Israel's life in Egypt, Palestine, and Babylonia. For Christians the concise action of God, bringing into history a full-length picture of his intention for humanity, is found in Jesus of Nazareth. This New Testament view of history is strikingly expressed by the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians, who contends that it was given to him "to make all men see what is the dispensation of the mystery which for ages hath been hid in God who created all things; to the intent that now unto the principalities and the powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."[8] Such language can

[5] Cf. Exod. 18: 10.
[6] Josh. 10: 19.
[7] John 5: 17.
[8] Eph. 3: 9-11.

only mean that Christianity is, above all else, a religion representing the most significant act and revelation of God in the historic process. Its premise is that God has been intensely active in human life.

If the biblical point of view is valid, it means that if we want to discover the nature and intention of God we dare not ignore history. God is trying to do something with and for the race; that is, God's intention for the race is inseparable from what he has done hitherto and is doing now.

The Major Shifts of History

Approaching our problem empirically, we shall try to discern the divine purpose in history through a discovery of the major shifts which have taken place within the life of the race. If we are able to isolate any such indisputable shifts, we shall then have an empirical basis for saying what God is trying to accomplish in the historic process. In determining such shifts we must keep in mind the many centuries of unwritten history as well as the comparatively few distinguished by written records. The former are overwhelmingly greater in number than the latter as James Harvey Robinson has pointed out so vividly.[9] Let us assume that the fruits of civilization, which it has taken the race 500,000 years to accumulate, could be achieved by a single generation of men in fifty years. If these men recapitulated the exact time schedule of the race, forty-nine years of their life would elapse before they would cease to be roving hunters and settle down to till the ground, harvest their crops, domesticate animals, and weave rough cloth. Only at forty-nine and one-half years would writing emerge, thereby introducing a marvelous technique for spreading and perpetuating civilization. For only the last two months of this fifty-year period would this generation of men have been enjoying the blessings of Christianity. The printing press would have been known for but two weeks, the steam engine for less than a week; only yesterday would Benjamin Franklin have discovered electricity, and for but an hour or two would men have been sailing under the seas and flying through the air. Such historical perspective should humble us and leave us with the consciousness that in all probability the race is still in the childhood of moral and spiritual achievement. This perspective should also make us more charitable towards the many failures of *homo sapiens* as he has painfully risen from barbarism to what we now speak of as civilization.

Viewed in the large, there are three major shifts which have taken place over this long period of unwritten and written history. The first of these is the shift from the external to the inner. By this we signify the progressive transition from external controls to inner sanctions. "First . . . that which is natural; then that which is spiritual."[10] In the life of the

[9] See J. H. Robinson, *The Mind in the Making*, pp. 83 f.
[10] I Cor. 15: 46.

race the child first knew the fist and the rod; only within more recent centuries has he begun, in enlightened areas, to know persuasion and reason as well. Likewise, early man lived, perhaps necessarily, under the most stringent outer controls. These were enforced through the authority of the medicine man, magical rites, taboos, superstitions, religious codes, religious institutions, and the general *mores* of the tribe. Early man was not to reason why this or that was right or wrong; his but to do what was predetermined by those in authority. Conformity to such findings, enforced through outer and physical sanctions, was exacted through fear plus the threat of punishment, both human and divine.

Despite sorry historic lapses, inner and spiritual sanctions have increasingly supplanted external force and outer agency. To be sure, the struggle to stand where one is obedient to the voice of conscience, of moral law, or of God has never been an easy one. The way to such achievement has ever been disputed by the established and objective forms of authority. Hence the rough treatment of reformers, nonconformists, separatists, and prophets throughout the ages. All such have listened not to the *mores* of the group or the voice of established religion and government, but to a voice which spoke within their own minds and hearts, thereby giving inner drive and authority to their contentions and actions. From Hosea to John Huss, from Jesus of Nazareth to Martin Luther, from Savonarola to Eugene V. Debs such has been the case. All these moved from the level of outer domination to that of inner direction.

In the larger life of humanity both democracy and spiritual religion disclose this shift to inner controls. In democracy, we witness the abandonment of that external and absolute power which was supposed to reside in a single monarch or dictator. Such a ruler spoke, and the people acted. He cracked the whip, and they bent their backs to the tasks and obligations imposed upon them. Fear of the monarch and the constant threat of punishment were employed to make this external domination effective and final. In contrast to this, the democratic experiment represents fundamentally a shift in control. While it is still true that there are external controls in democratic countries, embodied in legislative decrees, courts, and prisons, yet the final appeal is upon a much higher plane. Democracy stirs up the nobler impulses of human nature. It does not charge men to be good citizens or else——! On the contrary, it seeks to establish an inner control, challenging men to be good citizens because of faith in the experiment of common government and because they can help create a community of life beneficial to all. In such an atmosphere absolute power gives way to inner compulsions.

When religion reaches its acme of development, a similar evolution is apparent. Its general direction of change is from external authority

reposing in priesthood, institution, pope, or book to an inner, personal experience of God as the authority over life. This awareness of the Divine may be effected through the direct apprehension of the mystic or the less immediate experience which finds God through nature, humanity, or a contemplation of the general movement of history. In whatever way the awareness of God comes, when it is granted or achieved, the recipient enjoys a fresh centre of authority. This centre is a personal possession since it is within the man and generally, indeed, forms the hottest spot in his consciousness. Before its warmth all other forms of authority and compulsion grow colder and less appealing. Born anew, the recipient now lives under the control and guidance of the Spirit of God known within his own life. Whereas formerly he was good and pure, loving and sacrificial, because of fear of punishment, he is now all of these and more because he has been ushered into a luminous appreciation of the divine reality, love, and goodness. His greatest joy is found in being the eager servant of him who made him and who has revealed himself to him. This is indeed the discovery and response which makes man free. It is the perfect bondage of true liberty. Such a man is free since the ultimate authority is now no thing or institution or book apart from the man, but God himself known within the very experience of life.

Despite the current recrudescence and intensification of external controls in certain parts of the human family, it may yet be effectively contended, in the light of the race's 500,000-year history, that the dominant direction of movement has been from outer controls to inner authority. If this be true, and if it is further true that the attempt to dominate mankind through external controls inevitably leads to anarchy, such as we now witness, there is strong reason for supposing that this persistent racial movement represents part of the divine purpose in history. Certainly the religious man will so contend. And reasonably so! His is no irrational conclusion. Indeed, to refuse to see this major trend in human life, or, seeing it, to declare that it signifies nothing, absolutely nothing, is to close one's eyes to observable phenomena which cry out for positive explanation.

When the religious philosopher considers this large and persistent shift from outer controls to inner sanctions, it registers as a clear evidence of the activity of that God who works within the structure of the universe and the processes of history. Interpreted in religious language, this trend means that God's intention in history is, in part, to produce free personalities. "The stars in their courses" fight against all who would dominate the human spirit and beat it into humiliating subjection. It matters not whether such a tyrannical spirit is found in a father, an employer of labor, a minister of religion, or an Adolf Hitler. In the long run the tides of history will overtake his kind and destroy him. Such a person fights not

alone against his child, his workman, his parishioner, or humanity; he fights as well against God at work in this unquenchable tendency of the ages.

By a free personality we do not mean an irresponsible individual. That is an oft-expressed, but totally erroneous, conception of freedom, frequently denied. Long ago Aristotle pointed out that there is no freedom apart from loyalty to self-formulated rules. Indeed, the contradition of freedom is that the free man is always bound. Time and again this insight has received expression. So Paul: "For freedom did Christ set us free";[11] "he that was called being free is Christ's bondservant."[12] And the author of I Peter: "Live like free men, only do not make your freedom a pretext for misconduct; live like servants of God."[13] So Martin Luther: "A Christian man is the most free lord of all, and subject to none; a Christian man is the most dutiful servant of all, and subject to every one."[14] And George Matheson:

> Make me a captive, Lord,
> And then I shall be free.

When, accordingly, we affirm that part of God's purpose in history is to produce a free personality in man, we mean a personality bound to his will. God's will, however, is not something completely external or foreign to human nature. His will is rather written within our being, since we are made in the divine image. His desire for us is that we bring forth the quality of life of which our nature is capable and which, when produced, will be acceptable to him. This can only mean that when we are true to what we really are, we give expression to the purpose which God would accomplish in each one of us. On the other hand, when we do what we want to do regardless of the capacities for goodness inherent in us, we act either in ignorance or in violation of our true nature. Thereby we lose our freedom.

Our discussion thus far illuminates the Christian contention that freedom is never license. To do whatever we fancy is to take the broad road of folly which leads to destruction—and upon which many travel. Our freedom is rather dependent upon coöperation. We are free in the sense in which the schoolboy is free—free to coöperate with his teachers in the adventure of truth and the development of his life. The schoolboy is certainly not free to toss books about the schoolroom, break windows, or sing a song whenever he feels like it. His freedom to learn necessarily

[11] Gal. 5: 1.
[12] I Cor. 7: 22.
[13] I Pet. 2: 16 (Moffatt).
[14] Luther, "Concerning Christian Liberty," trans. by Henry Wace and C. A. Buckheim, *Luther's Primary Works*, p. 256, London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1896.

confines him within certain boundaries of expression. Likewise, man's freedom in the larger world is cabined within the purposes of God. While he may feel himself free when he does what he pleases, just as does the schoolboy when the teacher has left the room for half an hour, he none the less discovers that his true freedom lies within the limits of God's intent for his life and the race. Only when he makes the purposes of God his purposes does man produce a life which satisfies himself and a society which sustains the full expression of human nature. So history discloses that wisdom lies not in man's attempt to persuade God to coöperate with him. Not at all! It lies in man coöperating with God who is now acting. This is the freedom of coöperation, and it is the only freedom worth having. While such a person is bound by the will of God, in that very bondage he discovers "the glorious liberty of the children of God."[15]

The second major shift in history is from the impersonal to the personal. The disregard of personal values in by far the larger part of human history is dismaying, and the sudden and tragic reversions to the barbaric and impersonal are painful. Once more, figuring the life span of man on a fifty-year basis, we must remember that he has been having his spirit sensitized by Christian love and brotherhood for only the last two months. There is still room for improvement and probably a great deal of time ahead to effect it.

Despite this note of optimism one can hardly contemplate with cheerful face the story of man's disregard for the personal equation in his fellows. The cheapness of human life in ancient civilizations is disheartening. The slaughter of whole communities by Joshua's armies, the building of the great pyramid of Cheops by forced labor at an estimated cost of 100,000 lives, the infanticide frequently condoned by Greeks and Romans, the inferior status and mistreatment of womankind, the persistence of slavery and serfdom throughout most of the ages, the ostracizing and outcasting of people because of race, nation, or other condition—all these and comparable evils declare the inhumanity of man to man and the triumph of the impersonal. Nor have these evil energies in human life even yet been subjected to rational and spiritual controls. Many attitudes and acts in our civilization disclose this reversion to the impersonal. Among these we should list the treatment of certain people as Negroes, Japanese, or Germans and not as human beings, the toleration of slums, the concentration camps, the persecution of the Jews, the slaughter of the innocent to compensate for the crime of the guilty, the punishment of prisoners, racial segregation, the attempt to reinstitute child labor recently defeated in the New Jersey State Legislature (June, 1942), and the glorification of war.

[15] Rom. 8: 21.

Yet sickening as is the story of this ruthless exaltation of the impersonal, we find complementary inspiration in the recognition and refining of the personal. With slow but certain step man enters the appreciation of the values of personality. It has frequently been contended, and needs no elaborate support from us, that Jesus' great contribution lay in the worth which he ascribed to the human person. "What shall a man give in exchange for his life?"[16] "Whoso shall cause one of these little ones which believe on me to stumble, it is profitable for him that a millstone be hanged about his neck, and that he should be sunk in the depth of the sea."[17] The value which Jesus placed upon personality reveals a basic discovery on his part; namely, that the true nature of human life is personal. By *personal* we do not mean the individualism or personal differences between people; rather "the personal" refers to that potential quality of life which separates *homo sapiens* from all other forms of creation and, indeed, lifts him above them. While he is related biologically to the animal kingdom, man is yet qualitatively different from all animals. This difference is found in a superior quality of life and is the content of "the personal" dimension. It is because of this alone that man is to be treated infinitely better than a dog or a horse. What he is may have commercial and objective value to the merchant, the farmer, or the slave master; but he is also inherently valuable and hence must never be used with the callousness with which one might use a hoe, a truck, a lawn mower, a book, or a carpetbeater. This essential dignity and worth of the personal constitutes the source of Immanuel Kant's famous conclusion in morals: "So act as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person or in that of any other, in every case as an end withal, never as a means only."[18]

Many contend that the greatest emancipating force in the early centuries of our era was just this discovery of Jesus that human life is personal. Like a spring shower it burst refreshingly upon the hardened and parched spirit of the Jewish-Græco-Roman world. A feeling for personality flooded the countries bordering the Mediterranean Sea. In the light of God's love for men, revealed to many in the life and sacrifice of Jesus of Nazareth, each man became a being of infinite worth. For multitudes, religion was transformed from an institution in which the deities were approached by the state on behalf of all the people into a warmly personal quest in which each man approached God not as dread potentate, but as a loving Father concerned about each of his children. Whether such a picture of God is true or not, it is the distinctive New Testament picture and it profoundly implemented the faith of Jesus that human life is personal and hence supremely worthful. Celsus, one of the bitterest

[16] Matt. 16: 26.
[17] Matt. 18: 6.
[18] Kant, *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten,* Part 2, p. 57R (T. K. Abbott's translation).

opponents of Christianity in the second century, fought against the Christian movement because of the excessive valuation which it placed upon the human soul plus its absurd notion that God is interested in man. Such foolishness infuriates him, causing his pen to drip vitriolic words upon his parchment. Men, he raves, are no more highly favored or beloved by God than are ants and bees. "If," argues Celsus, "men appear to be superior to irrational animals on this account, that they have built cities, and make use of a political constitution, and forms of government, and sovereignties, this is to say nothing to the purpose, for ants and bees do the same."[19] The actions of men, when viewed from heaven, do not differ in quality or value from those performed by these members of the insect kingdom.[20] Celsus employs such argument to destroy the wild notions espoused by Christians that God values a man more than an ant or a bee and that he is more interested in our human kind than in other forms of life. Such reverence for the person, it is clear from the views of Celsus, constituted the poison which Christians were spewing forth upon the world. Yet this very contention that the ultimate category of human life lies in the personal is the seedbed of Christianity's philosophy, and the source, at once, of its force and greatness.

Strongly aided by the Christian view of God and man, this shift from the impersonal to the personal, though constantly and hotly challenged, has made slow but persistent progress throughout the centuries. We need not labor this point so obvious to every student of sociology. Suffice it to note that this second major shift in history is witnessed in such primary changes as those from the absolute authority of the ancient father to the rights of the modern child, from the inferiority to the equality of womankind, from the well-nigh exclusive rights of property to the rights of man, from slavery to freedom, from child labor to the protection of youth, from starvation to living wages, from the persecution of the mentally sick and the physically unfit to their tender care, from the humiliating of old age through the bitter bread of charity to its protection through social security, and from the glorification to the discrediting of war even when we are forced to wage it. "Though the mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small." The realization of God's intention for the race may be slow of fruition; none the less it ripens.

What is the significance for the philosopher of religion of this second major historical shift? It implies that the purpose of God for man is that the personal be expressed through each human life. Indeed, it means even more than that; namely, that a life is human only when the personal is

[19] Origen, *Against Celsus*, iv, 81.
[20] *Ibid.*, iv, 85.

lived out through it. Until goodness, truth, beauty, forgiveness, love, and the other qualitative aspects of character are expressed through the structure of our being, we do not bring forth a genuinely personal life. This is what it means to become a living soul, a true man, a child of God. And such God intends us to be.

Combining this second conclusion with that at which we arrived in our consideration of the historical shift from external controls to inner sanctions, we may now assert that part of God's intention in history is to produce free individuals who use their freedom to generate a personal life creative of an inward quality which is harmonious with his own.

The third major shift in history is that from the individual to the social. To some—due to equating in their minds the personal and the individual—this will seem like a contradiction of our second thesis. A clear-cut distinction must, on the contrary, be drawn between these two realities. The personal, as we have noted, signifies that unique dimension in human nature which separates man from the beast and from which the qualitative aspects of character arise. The individual, on the other hand—as we shall employ the term—refers to the oft-expressed claim of particular men or groups of men to rights and favored treatment because of their birth, their native abilities, their intellectual achievements, their national lineage, their racial strain, or their financial position. Such rank individualism has cursed man from the infancy of the race. It is the ultimate root of all slaveries, tyrannies, inequalities, exploitations, and oppressions. The rank individualist is the eternal enemy of the personal since he flouts the culminating fruitage of personal life, which is love, a quality within man which "vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up."[21] The individualists are those who think more highly of themselves than they ought to think. Their basic and destroying sin is pride.

Although we live "in one of the most absolutistic and autocratic ages in all human history,"[22] yet, viewed in the large, the trend of life has been away from the right of the individual to dominate and control other people for his selfish advantage. We have been moving towards the solidarity—even the sanctity—of the social group. Such a shift in no way disqualifies or cripples the personal. Indeed, it may be cogently contended that the full realization of personal life has a far better chance in a society which protects the individual than in one in which the individual may exploit his fellows at will. The evolution of character is all but impossible among brigands, cannibals, and gangsters where individualism has gone neurotic. It is much more likely to grow in democratic, coöperative, and Christian

[21] I Cor. 13: 4.
[22] Pitrim A. Sorokin, *The Crisis of Our Age*, p. 179.

societies where men are constantly exhorted to manifest regard for the personal rights and opportunities of others.

It is likewise necessary to explain what "social" implies in our present usage. In antiquity the social group was the absolute unit. Insistence that the solidarity of the group be preserved, not concern for the survival of a particular individual or a few persons, was the ancient code. The case of the destruction of Achan and his family that the whole group might not be destroyed because of Israel's sin is the classic example of such ancient solidarity.[23] Here life was not tending towards the social as a means to an end, but rather to the social as an end in itself. Little mattered in contrast to the solidarity and safety of the group. When we speak of the shift to the social, we mean no such absolute solidarity as ancient Israel's or modern Germany's; on the contrary, in our usage the social implies that form of societal organization which protects the individual from mob violence, exploitation by privileged groups, and arbitrary control by any leader or group of leaders; and which is, consequently, creative of an atmosphere in which personal life has a chance for growth and completion. Towards the creation of such a social environment, it is our contention, history discloses the race slowly moving.

Upon innumerable occasions mankind has witnessed the exaltation and even deification of individuals at the expense of the general well-being. The Solomons, the Alexanders, the Cæsars, the Napoleons, the Medici, the feudalistic overlords, the rugged individualists of our capitalistic economy, and the ruthless dictators of the twentieth century all personify the curse of a neurotic individualism having little or no concern for personal values. The tragedy is that such individualism, which knows "neither bounds nor authority," "disintegrates individuality"[24] or personal life in millions of people.

Despite the agelong endurance of such selfish individualism and the streams of incalculable misery which have gushed upon humanity from it, there is yet a tide in the affairs of men which steadily buffets its torrents as they burst into the sea of our common life. One of the most obvious facts about man is that he is a social animal. As such he is ever bent on achieving a true sociality or solidarity. Consequently, in his heart of hearts, he resents the presumption and intrusion of any individual who buys popularity or success at the expense of the general welfare, whether that individual be a politician, a corporation executive, a lawyer, a doctor, a minister, or a racketeer. The true goal of life is individuality *within* fellowship; never is it individualism *against* fellowship. No man, that is to say, has an ultimate right to achieve "success" at the expense of personal

[23] Josh. 7.

[24] Nicolas Berdyaev, *The Meaning of History*, p. 155.

values either in himself or in others. Whenever such a policy of ignorance is pursued, progress is always negated since human life at bottom is personal life. Such has been the shortsightedness of the tyrants, the conceited royalists, the business-is-business men, and the dictators of history. Frequently they achieve a quick but artificial solidarity, since they force it upon men without regard to the values of personal life. We now witness the perennial technique of such compulsion in the pogroms against the Jews, the concentration camps, the terrors of the secret police, military trials for civilian offenses, the firing squads, and the general brutalization of consciousness. Fortunately, even in the apparent strength achieved by such methods there is a core of weakness. One by one the tyrants and dictators fall by the wayside, destroyed by that which they would themselves destroy. They have always flouted the highest personal life which is, of necessity, a free life. At long last, that free life asserts itself, carrying within its power the nemesis of all dictatorships. History teaches this lesson in large, heavy type: *The tide of time pushes resistlessly against all crushers of liberty.*

In two areas of man's experience in particular does this trend to social concern and solidarity find expression; namely, in religion and in political life. In its inception religion, in all probability, was a family concern. It was an endeavor on the part of a small, blood-related group to conciliate whatever powers there were around and above them. The purpose of such activity was to win the coöperation of the divine in order to assure an adequate food supply, fertility, and protection from hostile entities both terrestrial and celestial. Later, when the social unit had expanded, religion became concerned about the well-being of a tribe, then of a nation, and, finally, of all mankind. The story of religion is that of a steady pushing out of the circle of religious, and hence social, concern. The spirit of all mature religion is that I am my brother's keeper and my brother is my keeper. For the fully religious man nothing less than the world can be his parish. Such is the case because, having discovered the full beauty and the ultimate significance of personal life, he longs to make it a social possession; that is, he desires precisely that kind of life for every man, woman, and child who enters the world. The spirit of such mature religion is no where better expressed than in these words: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature."[25]

In like manner there has been a slow but progressive enlargement of the social unit in the political area of our racial experience. The first effective governmental unit was the patriarchal group or clan based upon blood relationship. First the tie of blood bound man together in coöperation and loyalty with his fellows. After unnumbered centuries man took

[25] Mark 16: 15.

a long step forward when he discovered that he could be devoted to, and coöperative with, someone outside his blood group. In this way the family was transcended, and the tribe became the unit of political loyalty. The next logical step was taken only after many centuries of tribal life and conflict. Then tribes were united into federations or nations, such as is seen in the twelve tribes of Israel, the five nations or tribes of the Iroquois Indians, and the forty-eight States of our Union. Employing this principle of political amalgamation during the last several centuries, the nations of Europe have been produced by the federation of smaller political units such as free cities, duchies, grand duchies, States of the Church, principalities, kingdoms, and secular states. It is to these unions of independent and semi-independent political groups that the modern historian refers when he speaks of the unification of Italy under Cavour and Garibaldi or the establishment of political solidarity in Germany under Bismarck. It is this stage of national organization where we stand today in relation to political solidarity and loyalty.

It is neither pessimistic nor unrealistic to assert that much of the tragedy of modern civilization lies in the dogged refusal of political states to pass beyond the national stage of organization. This refusal had pathetic expression in the failure of the League of Nations. Representing, as it did, the one political effort of the world after the first Great War to pass beyond national limits of devotion and loyalty, the refusal to enter it on the part of some nations and the withdrawal from it of other states disclose the perverseness and ignorance of national man. In the political, as well as in the racial and economic, areas of life we have failed to perceive that the pressure of the universe is towards an ever-increasing sociality rather than towards racial and social exclusiveness. Such tragic misreading of the logic of history by our too-nationalistic statesmen must be set down as one of the major causes of the present world cataclysm. If we will learn this truth in none other than the bitter school of ruinous war, then, it is decreed, we must learn it there. Our present world conflict is, accordingly, no denial of God, but a certain indication of the working of God in history. If the desire of God is that mankind creatively achieve an increasingly social life, and if, in an age of marked technological advance which makes such social solidarity not only possible but also desirable and necessary, we yet stubbornly turn our backs upon the call to interdependent living; I say if, in such a world, no catastrophe came as has come, shaking the earth to its foundations, then we should have to conclude that the logic of history does not favor increasing sociality. But the storms have come. The floods have descended. We are confirmed once again in our thesis that history points to the social as the signpost of true progress.

Interpreting this third major shift in history, we reach the conclusion that God intends human life to achieve solidarity. The structure of man and of the universe is set against all rank individualism, which ever seeks to feather only its own nest. Against that the very stars fight.

Combining the significance of these three major historical shifts to the inner, the personal, and the social, we reach the following conclusions regarding the full purpose of God as discernible in history. God desires the production of free individuals who use their freedom to produce a personal life creative of an inward quality harmonious with his own. Men have such opportunity because the universe favors a sociality, tending more and more towards the world level, which ever protects personal values from the ravages of a conscienceless individualism. The full achievement of that condition is undoubtedly far off. Yet it is towards such a consummation that the ages run. These dominant shifts of history witness, therefore, to the reality of a spiritual energy within the universe and man which is provocative of a tendency towards an ever more inward, personal, and social organization of life. History is tending, in other words, to the production of what the Archbishop of Canterbury terms "the Commonwealth of Value."[26] In this movement we witness the slow realization of God's intention in history. Completed, it will usher in God's kingdom on earth. Then shall be inaugurated that age of which the prophet Jeremiah has God speak, saying, "They shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord."[27]

Jesus as the Embodiment of God's Purpose in History

For many Christians, the significance of this broad interpretation of history lies in the fact that they discover its personal embodiment and formulation in the life and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth. In his teaching and self-giving are disclosed what God intends a human life and a human society to be at their best. Here was a life lived under the inner guidance of God. It leaned upon no outer entities such as books, institutions, days, ceremonies, or persons for its final direction and authority. On the contrary, it drew its strength from an inner source, springing up like a well of living water, drawing its perception of the value of people and the meaning of history from a close communion with the spirit and purposes of God. As of every true prophet, the life of Jesus was one based upon inner and personal assurances, productive of attitudes and outlooks generative at once of a message and a way of life. Slight wonder that the

[26] William Temple, *Nature, Man and God*, p. 448.
[27] Jer. 31: 34.

people heard him gladly, being astonished at his teaching, since "he taught them as one having authority, and not as their scribes."[28] He never called them to bind themselves absolutely to a set of prescriptions, rules, laws, and ceremonial observances, which would thereby guarantee their personal favor with God and safety for their nation. Quite the opposite! He called them to a life of inner resource from which would flow beauty of character, purity of spiritual aspiration, and self-control. Hence, blessed are the pure in heart, the merciful, the meek, the peacemakers, the poor in spirit, the mourners, and those who are persecuted for righteousness. That is to say, blessed are those who have an inner quality of life productive of constructive attitudes towards God and man. Such enables them to regard women without lusting after them, to say yes or no and mean it, to turn the other cheek because one considers others before one's self, to go the second mile, to love one's enemies, to treasure the things of God rather than the baubles of earth, and to be unafraid of the future. The teaching of Jesus, plus his example, calls men to a life based upon an inner resource produced by faith in the character of God as heavenly Father and in his power as ruler of history. When men know this God, their centre of life ceases to be such externals as books, institutions, creeds, and rites, becoming instead the authority of the living God speaking within them. A transformation of this kind marks the first necessary shift of life from external authorities to inner and spiritual sanctions. Perfectly realized in Jesus, his true followers have never been satisfied with anything less. His is a religion of the spirit.

Again, in Jesus' teaching and character we witness the recognition and perfect expression of the personal. For him, the end of individual existence lay in the production of a life not qualitatively different from the life of God. Believing, as he did, in the immanence of the divine in human nature, no small part of his mission lay in awakening men to the possibilities of their real life. Made in the divine image, there was resident within men the power of self-determination which, when properly directed, would eventuate in a life of personal quality which God could approve. Because of this inherent capacity men could turn the other cheek, sacrifice coat and cloak, go the second mile, lend to the needy, love their enemies, and pray for their persecutors. Such things they should do not because of any fear that the end of the world is near. Such things they should do because such actions alone express what their authentic nature is. By expressing this, their real nature, they bring forth a life not qualitatively different from the life of God. Thereby they become sons of their Father who is in heaven. In a life of such character, the shift has simply been made from impersonality to the highest type of

[28] Matt. 7: 29.

personal life, thereby in a very definite way fulfilling God's purpose for the life of man.

That Jesus was the radiant embodiment of such personal life as we have been describing is the common faith of his followers. As Chaucer long since put it,

> But Cristes loore and his apostles twelve
> He taughte, but first he folwed it hymselve.[29]

Unlike many a preacher and layman, Jesus was the embodiment of all he taught. When he called men to beauty of character, purity of spiritual aspiration, and self-control, he but beckoned them to become what he already was. Even yet the Christian "finds in Christ what he longs for in himself." The impersonal impulses and considerations which degrade and coarsen life had been excluded from the character of Jesus. Hence his persistent concern for persons and personal values revealed in his teaching, his healings, his cleansing of the temple, his joining of issue with the Pharisees over the Sabbath day, and that last sad giving of himself without one bitter word of reproach tossed in the face of the viciousness which destroyed his body. In this choice life the personal came to full expression, disclosing God's intention for each human life.

Finally, the desire of God to shift life from the individual, with its lust, pride, and love of power, to the social, with its concern for an order of life in which the personal can fulfill itself, is integral in the spirit and teaching of Jesus. Having made the discovery that human nature fulfills itself only in the personal, Jesus allowed nothing to interfere with his intention to arouse qualitative life within men and women. Any program to stimulate such life necessarily involves social contacts and, if it is thoroughly impartial, the scaling of social barriers. This follows since the pinnacle of personal life is love, and love, by its very nature, is inclusive, shutting no one out of its circle of vision and concern. It is this inclusive nature of love which explains Jesus' eating with the publicans and sinners, his regard for Samaritans and Romans, and his impartial sharing of his personal energy with the rich and the poor, the noble and humble, the learned and unlearned, and the good and bad alike. Naturally, such a one would be called "a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners"![30] Precisely that price—or a comparable one—must always be paid by him who would effect a creative sociality between the outcasts of society and himself. Otherwise, the two live in separate worlds forever.

Even more astounding is the teaching of Jesus in which he inveighs against the absolutizing of any of the partial social loyalties. To make any

[29] *The Canterbury Tales, Prologue,* lines 527 f.
[30] Luke 7: 34.

one of these into absolute devotions is to misread the larger intention of God for the human family and his purpose in history. Hence the error of making one's family the final centre of loyalty. When his own mother and brothers came seeking him, Jesus turned to the multitude and said, " 'Who is my mother? and who are my brethren?' And he stretched forth his hand towards his disciples, and said, 'Behold, my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father who is in heaven, he is my brother, and sister, and mother.' "[31] A similar error lies in allowing race to become the final centre of loyalty, a temptation to which many of Jesus' countrymen succumbed. The prided themselves upon their Abrahamic descent, regarding all others as little better than dogs. Jesus is said to have attacked any such racial base as adequate for the social life of mankind, saying, "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham."[32] Thus he pointed out that the duplication of Abraham's way of living and not descent from him was the matter of crucial importance. It is also an error, Jesus teaches, to regard the nation as the final unit of community. Nationalism is not enough. When it becomes an absolute devotion, as it too often has in ancient and modern patriotism, it blocks the way to the larger good which God intends for the race. Jesus himself felt its vindictive lash. When he said, at Nazareth, that in a time of great famine over all Palestine, God had blessed no Jewish widow, but only a widow at *Zarephath in Sidon,* and when he told his townsmen that there were many lepers in Israel in the days of Elisha, but only Naaman *the Syrian* was healed, their nationalistic passions suddenly boiled over. Seizing him, they rushed him out of their synagogue. They believed that loyalty to Israel was the final loyalty. He knew that no genuine human community could ever grow out of any such absolutizing of the nation. His sympathies were too extensive and inclusive to be accepted by a people who made Jewish nationalism more important than God's desire for a social life of larger than national dimensions. The purpose of God, Jesus taught, is not limited to the nation of Israel, or the race of Abraham, or any family strain. It extends to all human life. When, accordingly, the author of the Fourth Gospel includes "the world" and "whosoever" in his famous declaration—"For God so loved *the world,* that he gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever* believeth on him should not perish"—he is giving us a remarkably true reflection of the mind of Christ and of the intention of God in history.

Slight wonder is it that men have called Jesus of Nazareth "the way." Among many other phases of leadership he is "the way" into a full perception of the spiritual meaning of history. His teaching, supported by a

[31] Matt. 12: 48-50.
[32] John 8: 39.

marvelous life, gives us unusual appreciation of the significance of the inner, the personal, and the social energies which we found steadily at work in the historic process. If we follow him, God's intention for the race can yet be realized.

Man's True Place in History

Man's primary responsibility in relation to history is to face up to the general trends in it and conform his life to them as indicative of the will of God. There is a certain "logic of events" in history, a certain definiteness of purpose and intention running through the pageant of the centuries, to which the wise man will not close his eyes. Comprehending these persistent and universal movements in history, he discerns the causes of many national and international calamities. No longer does he attribute these to the people's personal and social practices, such as cardplaying, dancing, smoking, theatregoing, Sunday amusements, or the failure to attend church. Such acts and omissions may or may not be symptomatic of more serious spiritual disease, but they are not in themselves productive of historic catastrophies. On the contrary, the tragedies of history, which today engulf practically the whole world, are seen to be due to a failure of men and nations to read the directional signs of history and to follow them in attitude and action. We note, for instance, the increasing integration of social life which has been made possible in our day by technological advances. Science has given us the steamboat, the railroad, the telephone, the radio, mechanical refrigeration, and the aeroplane. All of these inventions have pushed out the circle of life, demanding a higher degree of interdependence and mutual living from practically every human being. This impersonal push towards economic, racial, and social inclusiveness has, however, been resisted. It is only in the light of the centurylong refusal to recognize personal values through the granting of racial, political, social, and economic equality to the natives of Malaya, Java, Burma, and India that we can understand their apathy in the present crisis. And only in the light of our willingness to rule so as to bring such personal values to fruition can we comprehend the amazing resistance and loyalty of the Filipino people. Most men, unfortunately, still desire to live within the smaller loyalties of the nation and the race, when the pressure of technological advance and historic movement demands a world society with a humanity-centred loyalty. Having refused to conform to this shift in history, and failing to utilize the discoveries of science to make it worldwide, men suddenly discover that their narrow social loyalties lead to fratricidal strife. It is quite likely that we shall be forced by the pressure of discovery and events to conform to this larger social life. Thus we shall be pushed by necessity, rather than led by aspiration, as God would

have preferred, into that larger world-wide society towards consummation of which the signs of history unmistakably point.

The Unity of History

Our conclusion must be that there is a definite unity to history despite the clashing of armies and ideas. Throughout the whole of it God is at work. This fact gives unity to the agelong sweep of life, which, when surveyed without this perception, appears to be simply a jumbled mass of men, events, and dates. History is seen to include within the flux of contradictory human aims, ideas, and actions, the steady sweep of God's intent. In making the world God had a purpose. To deny that is to reduce God to one who doesn't care. To deny purpose to God is to find no divine intent in the life and service of Jesus of Nazareth. In short, to deny purpose in human life, society, and history is to reduce God either to a blind, unknowing, impersonal force, or to dissever him entirely from the world and the life of man. We have found good reasons for rejecting both of these conclusions. Discovering, as we did, a steady though oft contested tendency in history towards the inner, the personal, and the social, we have cause to believe that God is a spiritual Being and that he works within the life of man and history. Whenever one deals with the inner, the personal, and the social as we have defined them, one is dealing with energies which can only flow from spiritual life. The fact that man can realize the quality of life suggested by the inner, the personal, and the social is evidence that he is a spiritual being. The fact that the universe supports such life—and that the historic process constantly stimulates men to realize it—is evidence that a spiritual energy flows through the universe and history. Since this energy is spiritual, it must, of necessity, flow from a spiritual Being whom we call God. Hence this spiritual energy is God at work.

By way of summary, let me state in a few sentences the major thesis of this paper. God and history belong together. He who separates them loses one of our best sources for the empirical observation of God's ways and of his purpose with man. The key to history is lost when God is separated from the stream of events. And this, for the simple reason that, while history shows man in action, it also discloses to open mind and sensitive heart the unwearied action of the living God, yet toiling to establish his kingdom over all the earth.

AN INTRODUCTION TO KIERKEGAARD

GEORGE E. LEVY

Editor, *Maritime Baptist*

IT MAY SEEM presumptuous that an introduction to Sören Kierkegaard, in the sense of a first acquaintance, should be written one hundred years after the appearance of his first great work. Yet, such a task is neither presumptuous nor superfluous, for scarcely any other nineteenth-century thinker has been so greatly neglected by our western world. Today, where he is more than a name, the acquaintance with his thought has come largely through secondhand sources, which even at their best are frequently distorting media. However, these remarks do not hold true for South America where he has received the same hearty welcome he has been accorded in Continental Europe.

It is a very difficult task to write a brief introduction to Kierkegaard —a difficulty for which he himself is largely responsible. His thought ranged over many fields—literature, æsthetics, psychology, morals, philosophy, and theology. He wrote prolifically—twenty good-sized volumes in a dozen years and always with a touch of genius. While his thought developed progressively, he never treated a theme systematically. His ideas continually elude the reader, and in even the best translations lose much of that native brilliance and vigor which won for their author an enduring place among Danish littérateurs. The very best effort to consider even a segment of his thought in brief compass is to do him scant justice.

Any introduction to Kierkegaard must attempt to shed light upon three points, *viz.*, the entirely biographical character of his writings, the leading ideas he advanced, and the extent of his influence on twentieth-century thought. These are all inseparably connected, and a consideration of each by itself is not warranted.

Not the least of the many ironies connected with the life story of Kierkegaard is that the first acknowledgement of his versatile genius should have come from the literary critic Georg Brandes. Brandes, an outstanding writer and discriminating critic, the son of a Jewish merchant in Copenhagen, was not likely to be prejudiced in favor of a theologian and philosopher of Kierkegaard's type. However, the psychological insights and brilliant literary style of the latter appealed to Brandes. The former he pronounced "the profoundest of all time," and wrote in the most enthusiastic terms of the latter. In 1888 he wrote to Nietzsche about Kierkegaard as follows:

There is a northern author whose works would interest you if they were only translated, Sören Kierkegaard; he lived 1813-1855, and is in my opinion one of the profoundest psychologists of all time. A little book that I wrote about him does not give an adequate conception of his genius, since this book is a kind of polemic, written for the purpose of counteracting his influence psychologically. However, the book is perhaps the finest thing I have published.[1]

It must not be inferred from this warm praise that Kierkegaard was at once received on all sides; he spoke at first only to small responsive groups here and there among the most serious thinkers.

Kierkegaard began to come into his own shortly before the World War of 1914-1918, when the first translations of his works gained a wide circulation in Germany. He had been making his way slowly for twenty years before this, but the thinking of Europe during these years was too completely under the dominance of Nietzsche for any other to gain a secure place. The war, however, laid bare the true character of the latter's teaching, and men were horrified at the demonstration they had been given of the ethics of expediency and the doctrine of the superman. Demonic forces had been released that came near blotting out civilization. Kierkegaard spoke to this mad world in terms of these deep underlying forces. His thought proved to be a penetrating diagnosis of the dark evils of men's hearts which had proven themselves capable of producing such a welter of destruction.

Representatives of many schools of thought, often of a very different cast of temperament, have acknowledged their debt to Kierkegaard. His close counterpart, the noted playwright, Ibsen, expressed in the motto he put in the mouth of his hero Brand, "All or Nothing," the essence of the solemn choices of which Kierkegaard wrote. Karl Barth, the Swiss theologian and champion of the New Orthodoxy, avowed in those days when his massive system was being worked out, that if he had a system it was that of the Danish thinker. A school of psychology in connection with philosophical studies sponsored by such men as Jaspers, Klages, and Spranger found the impetus for its researches in the psychological studies of Kierkegaard. After one has read even a few of these psychological studies it is not difficult to understand why this school has specialized in the study of personality. Heidegger, a Roman Catholic philosopher steeped in the traditional thought of the Church, found in Kierkegaard the basis for his metaphysics. Unamuno, Spanish novelist, philosopher, and relentless foe of all false religions, learned Danish after he already read fourteen languages in order that he might read Kierkegaard in the original. His *Tragic Sense of Life* interprets the same issues that absorbed the attention of his Danish master. Through Una-

[1] Eduard Geismar, *Sören Kierkegaard*, Augsburg Publishing House, p. xiv.

muno, Kierkegaard was introduced to South America before the northern part of the New World was even aware of the extent of his influence on contemporary European thinkers.

In addition to the foregoing, it is correct to say that Kierkegaard more than any other helped to determine the temper of the theological and philosophical atmosphere which had come to prevail just before the war in the lands bordering on the Baltic. The same thing, perhaps in lesser measure, would be true even further afield on the Continent. Scotland, too, has reacted sympathetically to his thought as it has come to her through the writings of Karl Barth. In other sections of the British Isles and in North America the soil has not been so receptive. Until quite recently there has been the most unpardonable paucity both of works on Kierkegaard and English translations of his own writings. We are now under a great debt of gratitude to Geismar and Haecker of the Continent for their brief but illuminating studies and for the larger works of David Swenson and Walter Lowrie, both American scholars. Their sympathetic interpretations of Kierkegaard's leading ideas and their translations of his more important works have done much to fill a real need.

Kierkegaard stands in that line of tradition to which such men as Augustine, Pascal, and Dostoievsky belong. He experienced the same incessant longing and sensitiveness toward the deeper issues of life at times amounting to an insufferable anguish. His emphasis was always on absolute integrity, even when he was most keenly tortured by his own conscious lack of it. As Socrates, he feared error worse than death. "I want honesty," he cried, "neither more nor less. I stand neither for Christian severity nor for Christian mildness; I stand solely and simply for common human honesty."[2] The personal aspects of this problem with which he continually wrestled—how modern man may attain an inward peace—gave a keener focus to this disturbing desire. It was, however, a peace that despite all his efforts at sincerity he himself always failed to find.

All Kierkegaard's works are autobiographical to a rare degree, and take their place among the world's greatest confessional literature. In order to follow the course of his writings or to understand them at all it is necessary to know something of at least three shattering experiences that came into his life. Their formative character cannot be overemphasized. These played upon his sensitive nature as a flame on a highly inflammable substance, each in turn producing more heat and passion.

[2] Geismar, *op. cit.*, p. xxii.

The first of these takes us back to the heaths of Jutland. Here as a lad, Michæl Pederson Kierkegaard, Sören's father, had to tend sheep. The long, lonely watches in the cold and rain on the bleak heath produced a deep melancholy in the growing lad. One day, overcome by his unenviable lot, he climbed a hillock and shaking his fist in defiance at the grey sky cursed God. The memory of the deed preyed upon his mind until he died. "How terrible," his son wrote in his *Journal,* "that the man once a child, while herding flocks on the heaths of Jutland, suffering greatly, in hunger and in want, stood and cursed God—and was unable to forget it when he was eighty-two years old."[3] When twelve years of age Michæl was brought to Copenhagen and taken into business with his uncle, a rich clothing merchant. He had so far prospered that he could retire at forty a wealthy man and announced he would devote the rest of his life to the problem of solving the riddle of the universe and to rearing his family. It is not known how completely the savants who gathered around him in his Copenhagen home agreed that he had succeeded in the first enterprise, but many, in the light of his influence on his brilliant son, Sören, are convinced that he did not succeed in the second.

Michæl was twice married. His first wife died childless. His second wife, Anne Sorensdatter Lund, who had been a servant in the home, became his wife to save the family from the disgrace of an illegitimate birth. This incident did nothing to remove the prevailing melancholy from the mind of the elder Kierkegaard. Sören, the seventh and last child of the marriage, was born in 1813, when his father was fifty-seven. Peter, the eldest of the family, became a bishop of the Danish church. These two alone, Sören and Peter, lived beyond early manhood. From the hour of his birth Sören was completely under the dominance of his father who directed his education until time for university entrance. He never played games as other children or had companions of his own age. When he wanted to go for a walk, his father took him on an imaginary journey around the room or conjured up some form of amusement indoors. It is only fair to say that young Sören was prevented from engaging in many forms of youthful sport by a deformed foot. This impediment alone can scarcely be taken as a reason for his melancholy. Later when he looked back on these early years he wrote, and not without a trace of bitterness, that it was "humanly speaking, a crazy upbringing."

Michæl succeeded in transmitting to his son the same stern type of Christianity that filled his own mind and governed his ways. It was a gloomy, guilt-burdened religion, natural to one of Michæl's morbid

[3] Quoted by Theorod Haecker, *Sören Kierkegaard,* Oxford Press.

temperament and never meant for a child. Sören revolted against it while still in his youth, yet it held him all his days. He was a continual penitent and never experienced the sense of forgiveness and joy which the Christian religion can bring. His own psychology was defective in that he never discovered that one does not overcome guilt by brooding over it. And yet it was this sense of guilt which bound him to God for time and eternity. He saw the way to God only through judgment, which never became lost to his view because of the greatness of grace. To him it was a joy that the way to God could only be through suffering and judgment. At times he thought seriously of following the wishes of his father and becoming a pastor, but this was solely that he might atone by good works for the sins he had committed.

At the age of seventeen, that is, in 1830, Sören entered the university where he remained for ten years. The first eight he spent in a careless, often reckless, manner, squandering his father's money and doing little work. He passes over this whole period in the most autobiographical of his works, *The Point of View,* with the casual reference to it as his *"vita ante acta,"* and the hint that he often walked "even in the path of perdition." His father died in 1838. Sören regarded this event as "the last sacrifice his love had made for him," and at once began to regard his youthful career with shame. He now settled down to study and passed his examinations *cum laude* within two years. Just previous to his father's death he had experienced a religious awakening which he speaks of in his *Journal* as a time "of indescribable joy." He had not yet begun to write; all his works were produced within the last twelve years of his life, 1843–1855.

The second of these shattering experiences was Kierkegaard's tragic love affair with Regine Olsen. Regine, ten years younger than himself, was the daughter of a well-to-do government official. They met accidently in 1837 and at once became greatly attached to each other. In his diary he poured out continual expressions of his love, addressing her as, "Thou, the Ruler [*regina*] of my heart." Their love was not a sudden, passing fancy; it probably brought as much "indescribable joy" into his drab life as had his religious awakening. After three years, September 8, 1840, they became engaged. Shortly afterward, however, he wrote: "The very next day, I saw that I had made a mistake." Within a week Regine discovered he was troubled and pained. Then began a period of acute suffering for both lovers. Kierkegaard's biographers have offered many reasons for his refusal to go on with his engagement. Some believe that it was due to an incompatibility on the score of religious views. Would it be very surprising if a carefree girl, ten years his junior, failed to conform to his ideal of Christianity? Others believe

the reason lay in the haunting sense of his father's sin. Still others hold that the cause is to be found in the memory of his own youthful indiscretions. The fact is, that any explanation is scarcely more than a conjecture pieced together from incomplete references. All the reasons advanced above quite probably played some part in bringing him to his fateful decision. Despite Regine's devotion he repelled her love, often rudely, and finally after a painful year broke off the engagement. Later Regine married Fritz Schlegel, her schoolteacher, to whom she had been devoted before she met Sören. She and Sören never forgot each other. He made her his sole heir, and she, even as an old lady living to the beginning of the present century, was delighted to talk of him.

During these tragic years Kierkegaard remained a student at the university working towards the degree of Master of Arts, which corresponded then to the doctorate in philosophy. The degree was finally awarded for his masterly dissertation, *The Concept of Irony,* September 29, 1841, twelve days before the final break with Regine. Immediately afterwards he left for Berlin to pursue further studies in philosophy under the direction of Schelling, whom he termed "that old driveller." He had no heart for study; a burning desire to write possessed him. Regine, he said, had made him a poet. None of his admirers has missed that poetic vein. Thust, a German biographer, calls him "the poet of religion." From the deep wound in his soul there came forth a continual flow of essays, philosophical and æsthetic. He saw in his own sufferings the counterpart of the divine suffering, he drew from each such experience its last measure of meaning and transmitted it to the world in prose often as perfect in form as were the emotions deep and intense that it depicted.

All Kierkegaard's works are characterized by a highly pessimistic, tempestuous, and paradoxical strain. He saw only what Unamuno termed "the tragic sense of life." Every man stands on the edge of a precipice with nothing between him and disaster but the unlimited goodness of God. Contradiction and paradox are evident on every side—time and eternity, God and man, sin and grace, faith and works, Christ and all others. Between each of these opposites there is "an infinite, qualitative difference." Kierkegaard vehemently opposed the Hegelian dialectic that sought to merge these opposites into a higher synthesis. There can never be a synthesis of *both-and;* we are forever faced with an eternal opposition of *either-or.* A dialectic of *both-and* has nothing to say to man about the moment of decision, the "existential moment," when the solitary individual stands in utter loneliness before God, his helplessness revealed over against the complete holiness and sovereignty of God. In this moment the will of God as saving power or consuming fire must

be accepted. The smooth, all-engulfing dialectic of Hegel was revolting in the face of such awful decision.

There is little wonder that Kierkegaard was himself a sufferer and made so much of the fact of suffering in all his works. How could it be otherwise with any man who lived on the edge of an abyss, forever conscious of a burden of guilt? For him, as for those who have been his spiritual kin, the road to God must always lead through suffering. Suffering, as he spoke of it, was religious, spiritual in its nature, arising from a sense of guilt, from the ever-present awareness of judgment. No one was better able to express the depth and pathos of this suffering than Kierkegaard—he never seemed to have been able to escape it for a day.

Kierkegaard's first, and easily one of his greatest works, *Either-Or,* appeared in 1843, the stupendous achievement of eleven months' work. This book, as all his earlier writings, was published under a pseudonym, this time Victor Eremita. The writer pictured himself a hermit (*eremita*) who had become a victor (*victor*) over his doubts through living in seclusion. He purports to be the editor of certain papers rather than their author. One of these papers is entitled *The Diary of a Seducer.* This paper, and the others which make up the volume, are evidently intended to be an *apologia pro vita sua,* an endeavor to justify the course of action he had followed in breaking off his engagement with Regine. The ethics of discussing so personal an affair before an angry, mocking public is seriously open to question. The book is, however, more than an apologia. Here at the beginning of his literary career, Kierkegaard describes the three stages in the development of the inner life, *viz.,* the æsthetical, the ethical, and the religious. These three stages constitute a kind of framework into which he fitted his teaching both religious and ethical. *Either-Or* was followed the same year by *Two Edifying Discourses,* which were shortly expanded to eighteen. These he dedicated to the memory of his father, but it is quite evident that the memory of his unhappy love affair still holds an equally prominent place in his thinking. The *Discourses* are all deeply devotional and treat such distinctly biblical themes as sin, grace, love, obedience, and providence.

Late in 1843, still troubled by the unkind manner in which he had treated Regine, he wrote *Fear and Trembling* under the pseudonym, Johannes de Silento. Here he deals with life on the highest, or religious, plane and probes the depths of the question, "Can there be any suspension of ethics by a higher demand?" He answers in the negative, but the answer seems only half-hearted, for it condemned rather than condoned his own action. He returned to the same problem in his next work *Repetition.*

The period of pseudonymous writings was brought to a close with the publication in 1846 of his *Concluding Unscientific Postscript,* which contained the fullest treatment of his famous doctrine of paradox. About fifty copies of this massive book sold during his lifetime. One of his bitterest critics remarked the author might realize more from it were it placed on exhibition rather than on sale!

With the publication of the *Unscientific Postscript,* Kierkegaard felt that his work as an author had been finished and that now he was free to retire to a country parish. It is difficult to say whether he would have carried out his intentions or not, had not the *"Corsair* affair" confronted him with a new sense of his destiny to remain an author. The *Corsair* was a humorous paper conducted in the interests of the political opposition. It had a rude wit that appealed to the public. Few men in public life were fortunate enough to escape its jibes. Kierkegaard was among this small company; the editors had been even flattering in their praise of his genius. However, early in 1846 an article appeared on his work, *Stages on Life's Road,* showing a complete misunderstanding of the contents of the book. Kierkegaard replied in scathing terms through the columns of another Danish periodical of much higher order, the *Fatherland,* closing his article with the words, "Would that I might soon come into the *Corsair."* He had actually felt slighted that he had been overlooked thus far. Now, he had asked for trouble—and got it in full measure. At once the editors attacked him in an illustrated article of the most cruel and scurrilous character. He immediately became the laughingstock of Copenhagen.

The *"Corsair* affair" had another and little expected consequence. Kierkegaard believed that the cultured, among whom were Mynster, a bishop of the Danish state church, and Martensen, a leading theologian, would immediately come to his aid. Instead, they remained silent. Their silence added the needed fuel to the smoldering fires of his bitter anticlericalism, so that from this time forth the main theme of Kierkegaard's works was an unrestrained attack on the clergy, the church, and the prevailing type of Christian life. It cannot be said that the *"Corsair* affair" gave rise to this bitter anticlericalism; it merely brought it into the open. Entries in his diary and unpublished works for some years previously contained ample evidence of his scorn before it was made public. He now issued his works over his own signature. His conception of suffering deepened immeasurably and became the subject of some of his most beautifully written devotional works, still appearing under the general heading of *Edifying Discourses* and dedicated to his father.

Kierkegaard revolted against the easygoing, rationalistic type of

Christianity, or Christendom, which he found about him. He drew a clear distinction between Christianity, which in its ideal state he associated with the spirit and teaching of Jesus, and Christendom, the perverted form of the Christian faith his fellow Danes exhibited in their daily lives. He protested against the latter with all his powers. It failed to confront men with great decisions; it lacked heroism and quailed before suffering. In Mynster and Martensen, the leaders of the cultural and religious life of Denmark, he saw the embodiment of this sterile faith. In consequence his attacks assumed an intensely personal character. The quarrel was not unequally waged; he received blows as hard and cutting as those he gave. Meanwhile the attacks in the *Corsair* were carried out on a level as low and shameful as any ever launched by journalism of that stripe.

Time has not infrequently vindicated the cause of misunderstood genius. It has done so with Kierkegaard. Today Mynster, the bishop, would be quite forgotten were it not for the fact that Kierkegaard attacked him, while Martensen, the theologian who dubbed his opponent's works "mere phraseology concerning unhappy lovers and risks of faith," is read almost solely because of the discovery of the true worth of that same opponent. Undoubtedly Kierkegaard's ideal of Christianity was high and heroic. And yet, if Christianity lacks one quality more than another today, it is the heroism that stands unflinchingly for the highest ideals—and, at last, dies fighting for them.

On the second of October, 1855, a cold, grey day in the city of Copenhagen, Kierkegaard, a forlorn man then in his forty-second year, dropped to the street in a dead faint. Those who came to his aid soon discovered that his health was completely shattered and his mind clouded with a deep melancholy. In his pockets were a few coins, the last of his slender resources which he had just withdrawn from the bank. He was carried to Frederik's Hospital and carefully tended. His most intimate friend, Emil Boesen, remained with him until he died, November 11th. Unto the very end he had refused the ministrations of the church. Friends gave him a decent burial; then for decades to come he remained well-nigh forgotten.

THE AUTHORSHIP RACKET

MITCHELL BRONK

Formerly Book Editor, The Judson Press

It seemed to John actually providential. They needed a bigger income. If they were not making both ends meet now, what would happen when Baby Number Three arrived, as he—or she—undoubtedly would in the course of the next few weeks? Mary was always prodding him to ask for a raise; but he knew better than she did about that, knew that most of the staff were even now quaking in their boots in fear of either a cut or a firing.

Evening after evening he and Mary had discussed possible ways of earning some money, on the side. They got nowhere, however. Peddling investment securities and collecting industrial insurance premiums demanded more time than John would have at his disposal; besides, people were not investing these days; and there were already too many collectors running around, he thought. The employment advertisements he had followed up were mostly of this nature; or soliciting or introducing, on a dubious commission basis. As for Mary, employment was out of the question for her; she wasn't resourceful; anyhow, she was continually dragged-out, from those two children and her housework.

So the advertisement in the *Midweekly Review* seemed a godsend. It was intriguing in its suggestions, and especially to John at this time. It was captioned, "Increase Your Income By Writing," and went on to tell of the big money that men and women—it didn't include children, but might have!—were earning by selling manuscripts to the papers and magazines. The trick is simple enough, it represented; and easy; and doesn't call for exceptional ability. Everybody is doing it. A few instructions that the advertiser sends you in a short course of lessons, or in the criticism of a manuscript that you would submit to him, and you are all set.

The more John thought about it the more taken he was with the idea. Standing in front of the newsstand, mornings, waiting for the train, he had often wondered where all the stuff that filled those magazines came from: stories said to be true and stories anything but true; hundreds, thousands of them! Who writes them all? Why shouldn't he have his finger in the pie, as this advertisement suggested? There must indeed be money in it. People don't do that sort of thing for the fun of it—not nowadays. It's the bucks they are after—and that John was.

He recalled that a fellow in the office had once received ten dollars from a newspaper for the best "Impressions" of a fight at the Arena; and the fellow was no brighter than he. It came to him also how he used to contribute little things to the school paper when he was in high school. Could he be a writer? Why not?

It would have to be a love story, naturally; are not all stories about either love or murder? Come to think of it, all he knew about love played around his courtship of Mary. Not particularly romantic, and not exactly good story material, he confessed to himself; but he would color it from his imagination and from love scenes he had observed in the movies.

After a few evenings the writing began to take hold of him. He lay awake nights thinking how he should work out the plot, what he should have his characters say to one another. At the office they began to wonder what was the matter with him, he acted so faraway and was so absent-minded. Mary wanted to read over what he had written; but no, she should see it for the first time in print; moreover, it would embarrass him to show it to her now, it was so, well, personal; all about him and her—sort of "true confessions." Finished, the story pleased him immensely. He saw himself a sure-enough writer. In a few years listed among the best sellers—maybe.

He had already made a list of the magazines that looked as though they might want his story; mornings, again, waiting for his train, he had set down their addresses in his notebook.

Those magazines began to get his story. From them, alas! he began to get it back. It was an exciting time for him, a time of hopes and disappointments—mostly the latter. Thousands and tens of thousands of would-be writers have been through the same experience; or, better, ordeal. But for John it was all the harder because he had been so ignorant of the ins and outs of the writing game. Mary grew unsympathetic, even sarcastic; grumbled because the outlay for postage stamps cut such a big hole in his pay check. Nor were the rejection slips very comforting, for all their delicately worded regret and strained consolation: "Your manuscript doesn't fit in with our publishing program," or, "meet our immediate needs," or, "finds us greatly overstocked with similar material." John was learning by heart these damned omnibus rejection slips.

He wrote another story. Then another. They came back, sometimes almost by return mail, sometimes after a long wait. The long waits were especially tantalizing: "It means that they are seriously thinking of accepting it," he would think. It didn't.

Finally, he put aside what was left of his cocksureness and decided to let the "Increase Your Income By Writing" advertisement help him out—even if it cost ten dollars apiece for the stories he submitted.

The report on those stories was encouraging—as was to be expected—rather extravagantly encouraging, of course. It was evident that he possessed real storytelling talent. This talent needed cultivation, however. They could do it, most efficiently, and by means of their correspondence course in short-story writing. It would pay him to take it.

It didn't. He was out some more dollars, a lot of them. Long winter

evenings were spent on those lessons, and in making some more stories—according to their specifications. They came back, with the same relentless regularity as before. He didn't collect rejection slips any more, he burned them. "How do you know but that you can write, and sell your writing?" an advertisement in a writer's trade journal (he subscribed to several) queried. Well, John seemed to be finding out.

With all his limitations, he possessed considerable gumption: the kind that is perseverance. He would look into this matter, try to discover the reason, or reasons, for all these rejection slips—and no checks; and from someone who knew all about it, that is, from one of the editors.

Like many other unfledged writers, John was woefully unversed in the procedures of an editorial office and the psychology of the average editor's mind and temperament. He had somewhere read of editors who keep open house, even serve tea to their contributors. His trip to New York for the express purpose of learning why he couldn't be a writer was likely to be a wild-goose chase. But it wasn't. He had a piece of unusual good luck. He fell into the hands of just the editor he needed.

Once there had come back with a story not a printed slip but a real honest-to-goodness written note. It was scribbled with a lead pencil, to be sure, and said "No," just as the omnibus slips did, but its personal touch had been heartening to John, had taken the edge off his disappointment. He resolved to seek an interview with this selfsame editor.

There was no "open house" about the office surroundings. You had to get in to see the editor and you were not likely to stay very long once you were in; but this particular afternoon when John called the editor was feeling unusually genial—and so was the office secretary! So John had the interview, and what he learned in it might well be passed on to that immense public that just now is crashing the gates of authorship—for fame, or sheckels, or pure diversion.

That both the vocation and the avocation of authorship are overcrowded was our editor's first word. John should realize that if a thousand papers and magazines are looking for copy, a hundred thousand writers and would-be writers are daily stuffing the mail bags with copy which they think and hope will fill the bill. Because authorship is entirely open-shop, the competition is terrific. There is room at the top, to be sure, and because some readers are not fastidious, at the bottom, but standing room only. Moreover, while you think yourself smart, remember that so too are some of the other folks who are playing the game; and that, besides, you are putting your manuscript cards on the table with professional writers.

When John referred—would-be writers can't get away from this—to the many instances where persons have broken right into successful authorship, without going around the long and toilsome way of training and

practice, where first stories or first books have won prizes and popularity, the editor retorted with a little parable: A friend of his, from back country and a dullard at cards, had brought back the tidy sum of three hundred dollars from his first visit to a New York gambling house and the first card game he played there. "It does happen. That's why so many folks are today pounding typewriters and buying postage stamps and large manila envelopes and overweighting the mail bags. Yes, it does happen—but so too does the rejection slip."

As for the luring, catchpenny business of those "Increase Your Income By Writing" advertisements, the editor got hot under the collar in condemning it: "They do give honest help and honest criticism, sometimes, some of them, but mostly they are working a delusion and snare. They misrepresent authorship; gloss over the fact that writing isn't as easy as falling off a log; stress the gamble aspect of free-lance manuscript marketing; in short, beguile a multitude of innocent persons into believing that they can earn money by pounding into paper their commonplace fancies and crude brain concoctions."

In closing the interview, and not to be too disheartening with John, the editor tried to phrase in American English the advice of the French novelist, Henri Murger, to a literary aspirant: "You want to be a writer? For God's sake, don't want to! But if you blessed will, and are sure that you are hard-boiled and a stickler and not too big a fool, go to it!"

While the great majority of would-be writers are, like John, out after the accruing checks, a considerable number are motivated by what might be called "the pride of print." The pride of seeing one's self in print is certainly a very common weakness. Yet it isn't altogether pride, for the thing printed may be so wretched as to compel the writer to be ashamed of it. Maybe satisfaction is the right word—the satisfaction of bringing one's thoughts to the attention of a considerable number of people. The printed word—when printed where it will be circulated—is an opportunity, and an easy means of publicity. Even if you have a soap box, and a public park at hand, you may lack sufficient gift of gab to be able to stand on that soap box and talk so that folks will stop and listen; but unless you are pretty illiterate you can write a letter that your village weekly or city daily will print. It is free copy for them, and stuff that they know will be read. Or if you are tolerably literate, you may write an article that some journal will use in its columns—for there are a multitude of papers and magazines whose financing is so precarious that they must practice "We do not pay for contributions, at present."

The most advanced form of this "pride of print" is the ambition to be the author of a published book. If you want to know how common, not to

say universal, it is, consult the publishers. Their secretaries spend half their time answering the inquiries that pour in from the young and the old, the rich and the poor, scholars and nitwits, who have written what they regard as books, which they want made books. A publisher who adds thirty titles to his list in one year may have five thousand book manuscripts offered him during that year.

Not many would-be authors are so simple nowadays as to suppose that the publishing houses are hungering and thirsting for book manuscripts, but what most of them do not know is that it costs a lot of money to manufacture sixty or eighty or a hundred thousand words into a bound volume; nor do they realize that the chances are ten thousand to ten that their book will not sell when made—unless the author in question himself buys them. Henry D. Thoreau's good-natured confession still obtains: that he had a library of eight hundred volumes, all but three of which he had written himself. It seems the whole, unsold, edition had been turned over to him.

There has been not a little speculation as to what proportion of the books published are put out at the author's expense. Even approximately accurate figures are hard to obtain; publishers are reticent, and authors naturally so; but the number of such publishing ventures is far larger than is ordinarily supposed.

Some publishers hold strictly to the principle that if a book is not likely to pay for itself it should not be printed; but there are other, and reputable, houses that let it be known that they will undertake any really good book—but whose sale would be doubtful—if the author will guarantee the expense. Notice the stipulation "really good," for obviously it hurts a publisher, brings him into disrepute, to stamp with his name trash, or worse.

In a separate class should be considered technical, scientific, and certain belletristic works, of value and importance, whose sale would naturally be very limited. Such books are often financed by the government, by universities, or by foundations; and there are prosperous publishers who at times indulge in what might be called "philanthropic publishing." A considerable number of books, likewise, owe their appearance to the prevalence in the publishing fraternity of the gambling spirit, the weakness that possesses some of them to take chances—often big chances—on a book manuscript. Small fortunes have been made, but more lost, in such risky business.

While publishers decidedly do not need to solicit manuscripts for books, there are some who do it, and in some cases their procedures are unethical—from the best publishing standards. What is meant is, they unduly encourage the "pride of print" above referred to, lead persons who can't afford it to issue at their own expense books that they should never have tried to write. As to what becomes of this bound trash, and the fact that it further clutters up the already overloaded secondhand stalls, they

give no thought and have no care. They have their profit—sometimes a grossly unfair profit. Not infrequently three or four times as much will be charged for such a publishing job as a reputable publisher could have done it for.

Not dishonest, in a broad business sense, perhaps, but—well, sort of racketeering. If the victim is rolling in wealth maybe this is as good a way as another to distribute that wealth—for printers, bookbinders, and publishers are deserving persons—but where the victim's income is limited or straitened the outcome may be distressing. Commonest among these self-appointed victims are poor clergymen, with sermons which they and their admiring parishioners regard as highly desirable book material, and elderly women, with sheaves of accumulated verse.

If our would-be writer's ambition aspires to a book, the advice may be: If some honest, good-standing publishing house cannot be found to put out your material, and on a royalty basis, sell the sheets for waste paper—or keep them to read to your children and grandchildren.

JEREMIAH AND WAR

J. PHILIP HYATT

Vanderbilt University

"THESE are the times that try men's souls." Every generation has doubtless believed that these words of Thomas Paine's *The American Crisis* were applicable to its own times. But the historian, looking back over the centuries, can find a few periods to which such words are highly relevant, periods which were truly critical and transitional. One of these periods was the time in which the Hebrew prophet Jeremiah lived. He saw the collapse of one world empire and the rise of another, and lived through the decline and fall of his own native land of Judah.

The world empire whose collapse he witnessed was that of the Assyrians. The Neo-Assyrian empire had been founded in the middle of the eighth century by Tiglath-pileser III, but its last strong king was Ashurbanipal (668-626 B.C.). Weakened by international conflicts and internal intrigues, Assyria could not withstand the assaults of vigorous peoples from the south and east, and in 612 B.C. its capital Nineveh fell, after two months' siege, to an alliance of Chaldæans and Medes. The new world power which now took the place of Assyria was that of the Chaldæans (or Neo-Babylonians), whose most noted ruler was Nebuchadrezzar.

Egypt experienced a brief renascence in the seventh century under Pharaohs of the XXVI Dynasty, Psamtik I (663-609) and Necho (609-594), after about four centuries of weakness and frequently of domination by foreign dynasties.

Jeremiah's native land was influenced by these world movements. The great reform of Josiah in 621 had its political as well as its religious aspects. It indicated the casting off of the Assyrian yoke which had been on Judah's shoulders ever since Ahaz had submitted to Tiglath-pileser. It also meant the spread of Judæan control over the territory of Samaria, taking advantage of Assyrian weakness, with centralization of political and religious authority in Jerusalem. Josiah was very successful for many years, but met an unfortunate death at Megiddo in 608. Our information in II Kings 23:29-30 is meagre and obscure. It seems, however, that Pharaoh Necho was going to the Euphrates River to give aid to the Assyrians against their enemies and wished to protect his rear by making sure of the loyalty of Josiah. The Jewish king refused to give assurance of loyalty and was put to death—whether with or without a battle we do not know.

The Egyptian king placed his own vassal, Jehoiakim, on the throne of Judah. After the defeat of the Egyptians by the Chaldæans in the

battle of Carchemish in 605, the Judæan ruler transferred his allegiance to Nebuchadrezzar. After several years of subservience to Babylon the Jews withheld tribute, and a Babylonian army came to Palestine. The result was the surrender and deportation of Jehoiachin in 597, and the placing of Zedekiah on the throne. Another period of peace was finally broken by a second revolt, and Babylonian armies again came to Palestine. This time, in 586, Jerusalem was captured and partially destroyed, many Jews were deported, and a Babylonian governor was placed over the land. Thus came to an end Jewish independence, not to be regained until the Maccabean era four centuries later, and the Babylonian Exile ushered in a new era in Jewish history.

Jeremiah lived through these events. He began his public career about 614-612,[1] and lived until 585 or later. During his long career he was no idle dreamer nor mordant weeper, but an active participant in political affairs and an adviser of Jewish kings. This fact is of great significance, for Jeremiah lived in a time of war, when world civilization was undergoing profound changes, and he had a very definite attitude towards war—one which indeed may seem to us very surprising. The purpose of the present paper is to describe Jeremiah's attitude and then to attempt to explain it.

Jeremiah's prophetic career began after a vision of "a boiling caldron with its mouth from the north" (1:13). Many of his early messages were concerned with depicting this peril from the north in vivid terms.[2] Old Testament scholars have usually identified this peril with that of the Scythians, but I believe that he referred to the danger from the new alliance of Chaldæans and Medes who overthrew Nineveh in 612. If this is correct, Jeremiah foresaw the danger to his country from these people more clearly than did anyone else in his day; this danger did ultimately materialize as the supposed Scythian invasion did not. Jeremiah warned the Jews to prepare for defense by going into the fortified cities (4:5; 8:14). However, he believed that it was Yahweh who was sending this foe against the Jews (4:6; 5:15 ff.; 6:6; 8:14, 17) as a punishment for their sins (4:18, 22; 8:14).

The danger from the Chaldæans did not develop immediately. They were busy in the east for several years, and Egypt was strong enough to command the allegiance of the Jews. Jeremiah did not approve of this dependence on Egypt any more than had Isaiah a century before under similar circumstances.[3] He warned the people of the peril which lay in such false confidence:

[1] See my article, "The Peril from the North in Jeremiah," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LIX (1940), pp. 499-513; cf. also my "Jeremiah and Deuteronomy," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, I (1942), pp. 156-173.

[2] See Jer. 4: 5-8, 13-22, 27-31; 5: 15-17; 6: 1-8, 22-26; 8: 14-17; 10: 17-22.

[3] See, *e.g.*, Isa. 31: 1-3.

> And now what business have you on the road to Egypt
> To drink the waters of the Nile?
> Or on the road to Asshur
> To drink the water of the River [Euphrates]?[4]

The reference is clearly to trust in Egyptian and Mesopotamian alliances with their concomitant foreign religious influences. The faith of his people should be solely in Yahweh who was "the fountain of living waters" (2:13). Further warning was given in 2:36:

> Why do you so lightheartedly change your course?
> Of Egypt also shall you be ashamed, as you were ashamed of Asshur!

The precise chronology of events which led to the first invasion of Palestine by Nebuchadrezzar is not clear. Sometime after the battle of Carchemish, Jehoiakim recognized the ascendancy of the new Mesopotamian power and became the servant of Nebuchadrezzar for three years, and then rebelled (II Kings 24:1). Bands of Chaldæans, Syrians, Moabites, and Ammonites came up against Judah, but Jehoiakim apparently died a peaceful death (II Kings 24:6), in spite of Jeremiah's dire predictions (22:18-19).[5] He was succeeded by his son Jehoiachin, who, after a brief reign of three months, surrendered and was deported to Babylonia. (His name, incidentally, has been recently discovered on some cuneiform tablets of the period as "Yaukin king of the land of Yahud.")[6] Jeremiah believed that this was inevitable, as the will of God:

> As I live, saith Yahweh, though Coniah [Jehoiachin] the son of Jehoiakim king of Judah were the signet on my right hand, I would pluck thee hence; and I would give thee into the hand of those who seek thy life . . . into the hand of Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon.[7]

The attitude of Jeremiah towards the last king of Judah, Zedekiah, is quite clear from a large number of passages in the book of Jeremiah. At the beginning of his reign Jeremiah uttered a message, accompanied by symbolic action, the import of which was as clear as crystal: *Submit to the yoke of Babylon* (chaps. 27-28). The prophet even said, in the name of Yahweh: "And now I have given all these lands [including Judah] into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon my servant, and even the beasts of the field I have given to him to serve him" (27:6).

The king followed the prophet's advice for almost a decade, but then in his ninth year, swayed doubtless by the pro-Egyptian party of his court, he rebelled against Babylonia. An army came against the land and

[4] Jer. 2:18.

[5] This is not entirely certain, but seems to me the plainest interpretation of the biblical references; for another viewpoint see Albright, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LI (1932), pp. 90-91.

[6] Burrows, *What Mean These Stones?* p. 282.

[7] Jer. 22:24-25.

besieged Jerusalem for nearly a year and a half (588-586). Throughout the period of this siege Jeremiah maintained a thoroughly consistent attitude, which is best expressed in chapter 21. The king sent messengers to the prophet to ask him to inquire of Yahweh on behalf of the people. Jeremiah replied that it was God's will that the people and the city be destroyed and even said:

> Thus saith Yahweh: "Behold, I set before you the way of life and the way of death. Whoever remains in this city shall die by sword or famine or pestilence, but whoever goes out and deserts to the Chaldæans, who are besieging you, shall live and shall receive his life as a reward. For I have set my face against this city for evil and not for good."[8]

Jeremiah's advice could be summed up in the words: surrender and live, or resist and perish. This advice was expressed openly to the masses, with the purpose of inspiring them to desert to the enemy (38:2); that some of them heeded his advice is indicated by 38:19. He expressed it also to the king himself in a secret conference (38:17-23). It is small wonder that the authorities arrested Jeremiah for treason when he attempted to leave Jerusalem; he must have appeared to them to be acting upon his own advice, and they would not accept his explanation that he was not deserting to the enemy (37:11 ff.).

Jerusalem did finally succumb, and Jeremiah's predictions were justified. But the prophet refused the offer of good treatment made by the Babylonians; he preferred to remain in Palestine with his unfortunate countrymen. Later he was taken, against his will, to Egypt, where he doubtless perished.

Jeremiah's attitude towards a specific war situation is plain. Early in his career, before his country was actually invaded, he seems to have counseled preparation for defense. Later, however, when the international situation became stable and when the enemy was actually on Palestinian soil, he advised nonresistance and even desertion.

The reasons for his attitude are not immediately apparent. Are we to think that Jeremiah was an absolute pacifist, and are we to use his ideas as a basis for absolute pacifism today? Or, was he a traitor to his own nation—an ancient "fifth-columnist" or "Quisling"? Was he an isolationist or an appeaser? Or, does he fit none of our modern categories?

I think it must be said at once that Jeremiah was not a pacifist, if by the term "pacifist" we mean (as we should mean) one who does not believe in the use of force to settle international conflicts and who does not take any part in such use of force which he can avoid. We can hardly say that Jeremiah was imprisoned as a pacifist. It is not possible to find in his book any reasoned arguments against war after the manner of modern

[8] Jer. 21:8-10.

pacifist literature. He does not seem to have been opposed to war *per se*, but was dealing with a very specific international situation. It may be possible to base modern pacifist doctrine upon some of Jeremiah's ideas, but he was hardly an ancient pacifist opposed to war in the abstract.

It is certainly not correct to call Jeremiah unpatriotic; he was not a "fifth-columnist" nor a "Quisling." This is definitely proved by events which occurred immediately after the fall of Jerusalem. In 39:11-14 and 40:1-6 are duplicate accounts, not entirely reconcilable, of the offer made by the Babylonians of preferential treatment to Jeremiah.[9] In some way they learned of Jeremiah's attitude during the siege and, thinking that he was pro-Babylonian, offered him safe conduct to Babylon. Jeremiah refused their offer, but "remained among the people" (39:14; 40:6). He was not pro-Babylonian, although some of the Jews accused him of being such under the influence of his secretary, Baruch (43:3). Later, after a third Jewish revolt against Babylonian authority, he proved that he was not pro-Egyptian by refusing to take voluntary refuge in Egypt. He was forced to accompany some of the Jews into that country, but against his own will (chaps. 43 f.).

Jeremiah was not unpatriotic, but he was also not a narrow-minded nationalistic patriot. In a penetrating discussion of the patriotism of Old Testament prophets, R. H. Pfeiffer has described their kind of patriotism in words which are almost wholly applicable to Jeremiah:

> These prophets took issue with all the manifestations of nationalistic patriotism: pride in the people's past achievements, present power, and future triumphs; contempt or hatred for foreign nations; trust in military measures, diplomatic alliances, and national power manifested in wealth, culture, and wisdom; assurance that God would always fight on their side and give them victory; and enthusiasm for war, whether for self-defense, for recapture of lost territories, for independence, or for conquest. In a word, they refused to subordinate the eternal principles of justice and mercy to selfish national interests. All of them anticipated, and some witnessed, the bankruptcy of nationalistic patriotism; but through their unswerving devotion to a higher patriotism and to the spiritual welfare, rather than material prosperity, of their people, they made Judah immortal after the end of its state and the loss of its country.[10]

The key to Jeremiah's attitude regarding the wars of his day is to be found, I believe, in two factors: his realistic observation of the international situation, and his interpretation of God's will. These two factors are not to be sharply distinguished—as they were not in his own mind—but are closely interrelated.

We do great injustice to the Old Testament prophets if we consider

[9] See the discussion by Skinner, *Prophecy and Religion*, pp. 272-274. The second of these accounts seems more authentic, but even it is partly legendary.

[10] "The Patriotism of Israel's Prophets," in *Harvard Divinity School Bulletin*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 14 (April 14, 1942), p. 51.

them only idealistic dreamers. Several of them had very keen insight into the affairs of their time, and were frequently more logical and realistic in their interpretation of the political situation than many so-called practical statesmen. They probably took special pains to become acquainted with the international situation through conversation with travelers from other lands, such as merchants and traders of various kinds. Jeremiah could perceive that from a military standpoint Judah was weak when compared with the great world powers of Mesopotamia and Egypt. Judah was the Belgium or Poland of the ancient Near East and could not expect to stand up under the military assaults of the great nations. Jeremiah did not wish to see his country engaged in futile balance-of-power politics or in futile wars, even of self-defense.

Also, he must have learned that the Neo-Babylonian empire was, even as an imperialistic power, relatively lenient in its treatment of other nations. Although our primary sources for the politics of this empire are not very full, the information we do possess shows that the Babylonians adopted a fairly moderate attitude towards conquered nations. After the first invasion of Palestine and the capitulation of Jehoiachin, Nebuchadrezzar did not depopulate the country extensively and place it under a Babylonian governor, but put on the throne one of the sons of Josiah who ruled as king. Even after the more complete destruction of Jerusalem in 586, the man whom the Babylonians placed in office as governor was no "Quisling," but a man of ability and character from an old Jewish family. Gedaliah would doubtless have ruled over his country in a spirit of moderation for a long time if it had not been for a few hotheads who were bent on revolution—men whom his own moderate policy encouraged when he should have put them out of the way, as he was advised to do (chaps. 40-41). It was only after three revolts against their authority that the Chaldæans adopted a stringent policy towards the Jews.

Furthermore, Jeremiah had good precedent for his advice of submission to the greater power of Babylonia. A century before his time, Samaria had brought about its own destruction and the loss of the "ten northern tribes" by resisting Assyria in coalition with Egypt and other nations. Judah adopted a wiser policy of paying tribute to Assyria, and thereby gained for herself a period of at least nominal independence.

Jeremiah's interpretation of the international scene, however, was not based solely upon secular and prudential motives. He believed that it was the will of Yahweh that Judah submit to Nebuchadrezzar, whom he could term the *servant of Yahweh,* a kind of viceregent of God on earth. He thus developed to an extreme the notion of Isaiah that Yahweh could use foreign kings as instruments of his will (Isa. 10:5 ff.). In two passages which carry his ideas to their logical conclusion, Jeremiah has

indicated that he thought it was not only Nebuchadrezzar but even God himself who was fighting against Judah. In 21 : 4-6 he says :

> Thus saith Yahweh, the God of Israel, "Behold, I will turn back the weapons of war in your hands, with which ye are fighting the king of Babylon . . . and I myself will fight against you with outstretched hand and strong arm, with anger and wrath and great indignation, and I will smite the inhabitants of this city, both man and beast; by a great pestilence shall they die."

Again in 37 : 10, Jeremiah says in Yahweh's name :

> Though ye should smite all the army of the Chaldæans who are fighting against you, and there should remain among them only wounded men, yet would they rise up, every man in his tent, and burn this city with fire.

Jeremiah could predict the destruction of the Jewish nation with a certain amount of equanimity because he could conceive of the continuation of the religion of Yahweh in spite of such disaster. For him religion was not necessarily connected with the temple of Jerusalem[11] nor even with Palestinian soil.[12] The ultimate conclusion of Jeremiah's conception of religion—although he himself never quite carried it to this conclusion—is that it is a personal relationship between man and God.

In one respect Jeremiah's advice to his fellow countrymen seems to us illogical, or it seems to carry his ideas to an illogical extreme. It is difficult to understand why the prophet counseled individual Jews to desert to the enemy. It would seem to have been logical to have advised them to stand up and take their punishment—punishment which came from God because of their sins—and not attempt to avert it by deserting to the enemy. But it is hardly wise to expect the Hebrew prophet to conform to our logic. Perhaps his sense of the reality of God and of his providence was greater than ours can ever be.

[11] Jer. 7 and 26.
[12] Jer. 29 (the letter to the exiles).

Where Ignorance Is Bliss, 'Tis Folly

[Beginning with this issue the CROZER QUARTERLY will publish in this column a brief discussion of one of the many biblical passages which for one reason or another are commonly misinterpreted or misapplied. That there are many such few will care to deny. It need hardly be said that this will be done with the sole purpose of letting the Bible speak for itself, not for the purpose of ridiculing the notions of honest if misinformed, readers, nor to attempt to bolster up writings which through the centuries have amply proved their own strength and power. In keeping with the editorial policy of making the QUARTERLY of the greatest possible value to its many readers, we shall welcome suggestions as to passages which most need discussion.—THE EDITOR.]

IT HAS often been said, "The Bible suffers most at the hands of its friends." There is perhaps no more subtle—and common—source of this misuse than the habit of quoting a fragment of a sentence without its context. The rabbis called it "atomistic interpretation," and were past masters of the practice. Was not the whole Bible the literal word of God? Obviously God could not contradict himself; hence every word was in harmony with every other word. There are hosts of folk today—and many of them are not rabbis—who follow the same line of reasoning. But even for the moment admitting this contention, it must be obvious that utterances, quite regardless of the degree of their inspiration, unless quoted in their entirety may quite misspeak their author. The pickpocket before the trial judge cited biblical authority for his act: "Let him that stole steal." Of course that injunction stands in the Bible (Eph. 4:28). But the significant thing is, as the judge pointed out, that the two words, "no more," are also there. To be sure, as is often said, a clever man can find support for any and every practice in the Bible; not infrequently, however, it is by the simple expedient of omitting a negative or a qualifying phrase.

I have just read an excellent editorial in this morning's Philadelphia *Inquirer*. The opening words gave me pause: "There is no good." What a text for a sermon! But before that sermon is preached, it should be remarked that these were but the first four words of a longer sentence: "There is no good reason for the Senate's action in cutting the income tax deduction for each dependent from $400 to $300." An inspired word surely, but hardly to be deduced from the first four words.

How many times this past year I have heard in sermons and read in essays and addresses that the gravest need today is to go back to the sublime words with which the Bible opens: "In the beginning God." It is not my purpose to question the majesty of the utterance nor to deny that it would be a glorious start for Holy Writ; but simply to remark that

that word is not there to be found. For at least nine hundred years Hebrew scholars have been uncertain how to construe the opening verse of Genesis. Is it a complete sentence: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," or is it a temporal clause subordinate either to verse 2 or verse 3? An increasingly large group of experts today believe the latter to be the case. Thus Moffatt translates: "When God began to form the universe, the world was void and vacant, . . ." Professor Meek, in *The Complete Bible: An American Translation* (the so-called "Chicago Translation") agrees: "When God began to create the heavens and the earth, the earth was a desolate waste, . . ." If this view be correct—and the arguments are weighty—how many points, once hotly debated, drop out of sight! "In the beginning" no longer is puzzling; it simply equals "when." There is little point to argue longer about whether the creative act was *ex nihilo* or whether we have represented what must for want of a better term be called a "created chaos."

But the point to be stressed is that even if the traditional translation —remote as the likelihood is—be the correct one, there is no more justification for stopping short with the opening words, "In the beginning God," than with those of the rival translation, "When God began." Surely every protagonist for theism would cry to heaven against the gross misuse of the Bible were a humanist to support his contention by such a scriptural text.

Nor can the preacher defend himself by asserting that he did not know. In religion, as in law, ignorance is no excuse. There are commentaries. A little time spent in reading the material relevant to his next Sunday's text in the *International Critical Commentary* may be a drain on the enthusiasm of the man who is more proficient in sociology and psychology than in Hebrew and Greek, but it will probably guard him and his congregation against misinformation. The minister is, or should be, a teacher; if due to imperfect preparation and impatience, he is unwilling to satisfy himself that he knows what he is talking about, his is truly a heavy responsibility. Where ignorance is bliss, *'tis* folly!

From Off the Campus and On

THE FIRST ARTICLE in this issue should prove of especial interest. Some months ago an article from Professor Reid, of Wake Forest, "The Layman Observes the Minister," aroused wide and favorable comment. Many letters of commendation came to both author and editor. Several thousand offprints were purchased by one organization of laymen for private distribution. That the pulpit does influence the pew—for better or for worse—is not to be denied. It should not be overlooked, however, that the pew just as certainly influences—perhaps the word *shapes* is not too strong—the pulpit. It is not inconceivable that among the enthusiastic lay readers of that article, who discovered therein hitherto undetected reasons for their own slack hands, there are a good number who are themselves "standing in the need of prayer." In fact, instead of singing too complacently, as they gaze with disapproval on the preacher, "God send us men, whose aim shall be . . ." they might with profit listen to the lament of yesteryear, now sung in clerical tenor, "You made me what I am today; I hope you're satisfied." So apparently feels Robert Munson Grey, and he does not hesitate to say so. Many of our readers already know him as the author of the daring and altogether delightful novel, *I, Yahweh* [Willett, Clark & Co., 1937], which appeared five years ago. After graduating from Boston University in arts and theology, Mr. Grey did graduate work at Clark University and at Harvard. During his twenty-five years in the pastorate he has held but two charges—one in Worcester, one in Woburn. In the latter church, which has just celebrated its three-hundredth anniversary, he has been minister for nearly eighteen years.

One of the woes of a theological professor in these days of snap and pep is the abysmal ignorance his students display of what used to be considered essential for a tolerably educated man, the classics. To be sure, all do not reach the absolute zero of the young man, a college graduate, who asked the identity of "this So-crates" [two syllables, please] to whom he had just seen reference; most of them, however, are pretty cold. It is thus a particular pleasure to print this charming and disarming essay by the veteran classicist, William K. Prentice, "The Classics and the Bible." For forty-seven years he was a member of the faculty of Princeton University, becoming professor *emeritus* in 1941. He is the author of many books and monographs, the most recent of which is *The Ancient Greeks,* which appeared in 1941.

Professor Davis, of the Crozer faculty, needs no introduction. He is a graduate of Colgate-Rochester and a doctor of philosophy of Yale. Following a pastorate at Columbus, Ohio, he came to Crozer as professor of Christian theology. His thoughtful and rewarding essay, "God and His-

tory," was listened to with keen appreciation this past September, when delivered as the annual matriculation address.

At the present moment Kierkegaard is a name to conjure with. Everyone is talking about him, although few seem to know much about him except how to mispronounce his name. Dr. Levy, a former contributor to the CROZER QUARTERLY, turns on a little light. Formerly a parish minister in New Brunswick, he has recently gone to Wolfville, Nova Scotia, to become editor of the *Maritime Baptist.*

The name, Mitchell Bronk, is known to all Baptists. In 1924, after thirty years in the pastorate, he came to The American Baptist Publication Society, where he served until his recent retirement, as editor of Sunday school publications and book editor. Articles and book reviews of this gifted Crozer graduate have frequently appeared in these pages. An able writer himself and an editor of many years' experience, he is particularly fitted to discuss the "authorship racket."

J. Philip Hyatt is assistant professor of Old Testament in the Vanderbilt University School of Religion. He holds degrees from Baylor, Brown, and Yale Universities. During his student days he held the coveted Two Brothers fellowship from Brown, for graduate study in Palestine. He went to Vanderbilt in 1941, following six years on the faculty at Wellesley.

Once again a distinguished list of experts contribute reviews and notices of recent books. No one of them is a newcomer to our pages or in need of extended introduction. J. S. Bixler, formerly of Harvard, is now president of Colby College. Professor Brightman, of Boston University, is a frequent and ever-welcome contributor. Professor Brush holds the chair of church history at Andover Newton. Professor Hallowell, of the department of anthropology in the University of Pennsylvania, will be remembered for his article, "Some Reflections of the Nature of Religion," which appeared in the last issue of the CROZER QUARTERLY. Mr. Keighton is minister of the Church of the Evangel in Narberth. It seems strange to introduce Dr. Matthews in this column. As a member of the Crozer faculty for many years, his reviews appeared regularly in these pages, and unintroduced, because he was not *off the campus* but *on.* In this connection it may be remarked that his successor is Dr. James B. Pritchard, whose reviews will not be "introduced" hereafter, since as a member of the faculty he will be taken for granted. Professor Pratt, of Williams, is a reviewer who fills the heart of any editor with joy. Mr. Westphal, a graduate of Rochester, has been for many years minister of the Baptist church at Lansdowne, Pennsylvania. Alban G. Widgery will be remembered for his trenchant "Further Comments on Christian Ethics" [January, 1942]. He is head of the department of philosophy in Duke University.

BOOK REVIEWS

Religion in Colonial America, by William Warren Sweet, New York, Scribner, 1942, pp. xiii, 367, $3.00.

It was many years before a course on the history of American Christianity, or on the significance of Christianity's contribution in American affairs, entered the curriculum of any theological seminary either at home or abroad. Any attention that was given to this subject in the early years of this century was very superficial. If taught at all, it usually consisted in presenting a hasty sketch of the history in America of that sectarian body which the particular school represented.

The large place the history of Christianity in America now holds in most of the curricula of our schools of religion is due in no small degree to the studies and publications of Professor Sweet. He began his teaching at De Pauw University in 1913, and the number of standard books he has to his credit equals almost one for each two years of the period since that date. In addition, innumerable articles have come from his pen, and a number of volumes are now in course of preparation.

A comprehensive study of the divergent, and sometimes conflicting, religious views, and their representative institutions, in the Colonial Period has long been needed. Into this virgin land from the continent of Europe, came not only peoples of various nationalities, with their clashing cultures, but also people of the one dominant race, the Anglo-Saxons, with their manifold doctrines and institutional concepts, as bitter in controversy and persecution as those emanating from racial characteristics and distinctions. The cruel animosities, bred by the Protestant Reformation, were transported to the shores of the New World. Yet in this land champions and defenders of these opposing religious positions learned to live together harmoniously though they may still hold to a semblance, at least, of the original positive affirmations.

Professor Sweet has told the story well. The picture of the cradle of the Protestant family on the Continent, but chiefly in the British Isles, is clearly drawn. The swarming of the children from the homeland is adequately presented. The scattering of the generations in the wilderness, with an account of their efforts to achieve their original objectives, makes absorbing and instructive reading. The book, in the main, will find a place of value on the shelves of private and institutional libraries. It has been issued as a Religious Book Club selection.

Yet there are some misstatements or incautious statements that are not of minor consequence.

On p. 92, Anne Hutchinson is said to have "boldly stated that only John Cotton and her brother-in-law John Wheelwright preached a covenant of Grace; all the other ministers, a covenant of works." What she asserted was that only Cotton and Wheelwright were *under* the Covenant of Grace and, by implication, all others were therefore under the Covenant of Works. By this she meant that only the first two were "regenerate" men, who knew Christ experientially or belonged to him through a mystic unity with him. By this she implied that all the other ministers of the colony were not "regenerate," "were none of Christ's," but were men of office only. It was tantamount to calling them Pharisees, ceremonialists, creatures of legalism only. Her charge was not that they preached such a gospel.

On p. 140 Dr. Sweet writes of "the Quaker colonies where freedom of conscience prevailed"; and on p. 162 appears the sentence, "His [Penn's] crowning achievement and the principal reason for the permanent place he occupies in history is the founding of a State where liberty of conscience was guaranteed."

These statements are not quite correct. It is very questionable whether Penn intended to grant complete religious liberty in the full meaning of that term and whether he did guarantee freedom of worship even for all Christians.

Article Thirty-five of his *Laws Agreed upon in England,* April, 1682, reads: "That all persons living in this province, who confess and acknowledge the one almighty and eternal God, to be the creator, upholder and ruler of the world . . . shall in no ways be molested or prejudiced for their religious persuasions or practice in matters of faith and worship, nor shall they be compelled at any time to frequent or maintain any religious worship, place or ministry whatever."

Would this include non-Christians other than Jews, or atheists?

"The Great Law or The Body of Laws, . . . *Past At an Assembly held at Chester, alias, Upland, the 7th day of the 10th Month called December, 1682,*" confirmed this article. But Chapter II of that law enacts, "That all officers and persons Commissionated and employed in the service of the government in this Province, and all Members and Deputies elected to serve in the Assembly thereof. and all that have a Right to elect such Deputies, shall be such as profess and declare they believe in Jesus Christ to be the son of God, the Saviour of the world. . . ."

This chapter or article was abrogated by William and Mary in 1693, but it was re-enacted by the Pennsylvania Assembly in *A Petition of Right* in that same year.

In the minutes of the Provincial Council for May 26, 1769, may be found the record:

> The Governor laid before the Board a Bill entituled "An Act to enable John Cottringer and Joseph Cauffman to hold Lands in this Province." . . . The Board having considered that the Persons mentioned in the Bill are Roman Catholicks, and being of Opinion that any Act for Naturalizing such Persons so as to enable them to hold Lands, would be repugnant to an Act of Parliament passed in the entituled "An Act ," advised the Governor to refuse his Assent to the said Bill, and the Secretary was directed to carry it back to the Assembly, with a Message that he cannot agree to it.

Evidently freedom of *orthodox* Christian doctrine and worship was guaranteed, but the full rights of citizenship were not enjoyed by the unorthodox and Roman Catholics. In fact, as early as June, 1734, the Governor, Patrick Gordon, raised the question whether certain Roman Catholics, who had recently built a "House" for observance of the Mass, on Walnut Street, Philadelphia, really had a right to this toleration, as some "of that Perswasion here" imagined they had "from some of the general Expressions in the Charter of Privileges granted to the Inhabitants of this Government by our late Honourable Proprietor. . . ." His board, carefully weighing the matter, advised cautious procedure, and the point was not again projected.

Again, I question the statement made on p. 78, "Since the primary purpose of the Pilgrims' coming to America was to preserve their peculiar type of church polity, which they believed was the only kind sanctioned by the Bible, they subordinated all their interests to that one concern." Governor Bradford, in Chap. IV, Vol. I, of his *History of the Plimmoth Plantation,* gives as the chief causes of the migration the discontent and hardships of the Separatists in Holland. "For many," he says, "though they desired to injoye the ordinances of God in their puritie, and the libertie of the gospell with them, yet (alass) they admitted bondage—with deanger of conscience, rather then to indure these hardships; yea, some preferred, and chose the prisons in England, rather then this libertie in Holland, with these afflictions."

Moreover, in their correspondence with the Virginia Company of London they declare: "The King's Majesty wee acknolidg for Supreame Governor in his Dominion in all causes and over all parsons [persons], and that none maye decklyne or apeale from his authority or judgment in any cause whatever. . . . Wee judg itt lawfull for his Majesty to apoynt bishops, civill overseers, or officers in awthoryty onder hime, in the severall provinces, dioses, congregations or parrishes to oversee the Churches and governe them civilly according to the Lawes of the Land. . . ."

R. E. E. HARKNESS

Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race, by M. F. Ashley Montagu (with a foreword by Aldous Huxley), New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. xi, 216, $2.25.

This is a book everyone should read, because everyone, anthropologist and layman alike, thinks he knows what "race" means. Yet it is doubtful whether he is fully aware of the complete range of equivocal meanings that have clustered around this weasel word. The author's aim is to clarify our thinking about "race" in the light of modern research in genetics, cultural anthropology, and psychiatry. In fact, he advocates that "race" as a scientific term be dropped and the more noncommittal phrase "ethnic group" be substituted, a suggestion also made by the biologist Julian Huxley and others.

Race in anthropology has been associated with the idea of an immutable complex of hereditary characteristics that sharply separate groups of mankind from each other. This is a static concept and, according to the author, artificial and pre-Mendelian. Post-Mendelian research, based on knowledge of the behavior of genes, demands that the inheritance of separate characters be studied—not complexes of traits. Such studies have already shown that blood groups in mankind show a distribution entirely independent of cephalic index or skin color. From the standpoint of modern genetics, therefore, the so-called human *races* "merely represent different kinds of temporary mixtures of genetic materials common to all mankind" that are undergoing differentiation under the influence of such isolating mechanisms as natural, social, and sexual selection. The result is the maintenance of a differential frequency of gene distribution in local groups and populations. These are ethnic groups. In contrast to a static taxonomic concept of "race" such a conceptualization is dynamic and in accord with contemporary biological research.

Some of the other items in the great mythology of race dissipated by the author are the idea that race crossing (hybridization) is harmful and leads to biologically inferior types; that there are "inferior" and "superior" races; that physical differences between ethnic groups reflect underlying mental differences; and that race and culture are connected, instead of being independent variables. It is also pointed out that race prejudice is a product of cultural conditioning; and there is an excellent discussion of how aggression in individuals, resulting from early frustrations, may find an outlet in "racial" enmities. It is a fatal delusion, then, from a rational point of view to conceptualize the "race" problems of our civilization as biological problems at all. They are socio-psychological problems and must be examined in their cultural context if they are to be dealt with realistically. In the social context of America, for instance, "Negroes, Jews, Japanese, and Indians are in actual practice treated by dominant white groups as if they were members of specific castes."

The author discusses "Race" and Democracy in his final chapter. Among other

things, he says: "What we, as informed and enlightened citizens living under a democratic form of government, ought to do is to stress the fundamental kinship of all mankind; to stress the likeness that we all bear to one another, to recognize the essential unity of all mankind in the very differences which individuals of all ethnic groups display." Although he does not say so, it is obvious that the dissipation of race mythology is essential if not only a democracy but a democracy in consonance with Christian ideals is ever to prevail. And there is an even more urgent issue. This is a global war on the ideological as well as the military front. Today racial mythology has serious political implications. It may even prove to be a dangerous boomerang as the war aims of the Allied Nations become further crystallized. For this reason alone, Ashley Montagu's book deserves the most careful reading and reflection as a basis for action.

A. IRVING HALLOWELL

The Bible Is Human, by Louis Wallis, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. xi, 330, $2.50.

Here is an interesting and irritating volume. It is written by a sociologist who has a vivid imagination, a facile pen, and is unhampered by a decadent orthodoxy, and not unduly burdened by caution. This is all to the good. Hence the title to the book. It clearly expresses the underlying principle of the study. The material presented adequately sustains the proposition. The Bible *is* human. It is an earthen vessel with all the earmarks of human workmanship. Many of these features are frankly stated. Mythology abounds. Legend occupies large spaces in the early Old Testament documents (pp. 30-40, 115, 116, 142-147, 179-182). Judah, Jacob, the twelve tribes, and probably Moses were but the personifications of late Hebrew ideals in the guise of early history (pp. 30, 31, 35, 70, 256-258, 263, 264). Hebrew history, as now found in the Bible, has been so distorted by late Judaic editors that only the keenest criticism can detect the progress of national life and appreciate the various steps in religious development.

But beneath our present records, doctored as they have been by priestly scribes, the author finds the sure evidence of the gradual development of Hebrew religion, largely due to the constant struggle between two types of thought, Baalism the lower, and Yahwism the higher.

There must be approval of the thesis, and also, in general, of the way in which it is supported. The religion of the Hebrews, like that of all other religions, was evidently a development, influenced largely by social conflicts. It moved from the simple to the complex, from the crude and barbarous to the finer and the more idealistic. Progress was achieved as the result of struggle. Blood and sweat and tears have ever been the pathway to progress. Trial and error, the time-honored method of education, was not without controversy, contradiction, and blunder, all of which are apparent in the records. There is abundant evidence that late priestly editors exploited the early tribal and national history in the interest of miracle and the supernatural (pp. 11, 12, 150, 234, 249, 258-264, 296). These armchair strategists misled later generations and founded an orthodoxy that long has been a barrier to greater human values. Later New Testament writers exploited the Old Testament in the interest of a mechanical Messianism (pp. 11-15, 18, 118), and still later theologians exploited the ancient Scriptures in the interest of dogmas growing out of personal prejudices (pp. 3, 8, 15, 16, 111, 179). The pathway of Christian thought, thus having become a rut, the translators of the Bible, especially the Authorized Version, in not a few cases twisted and changed the

original text into the mold of current orthodoxy (pp. 12-16, 29, 70, 93). Thus due to a long process—the work of editors, theologians, and translators, each loyal to the tenets of his particular school—the Bible today very largely obscures for the average reader the actual historical development of our ancient religion. Dr. Wallis has essayed the task of removing the varnish, stripping off the veneer, and restoring the grain and color of the original. He has done a good piece of work. The wider the circle of readers of this material within the church, and the more intelligent the reaction thereto, the better for the future of religion. So far all is interesting and profitable.

But the book is irritating. The subtitle, "A Study in *Secular* History," is perplexing. Is this a sop thrown out to mediæval thinking that still abounds? To the reviewer this reconstruction of history seems much more honest, hence more religious, than does the priestly manipulation of history in the interest of magic, or the later mechanical interpretation of early writings in the interest of Messianism. Then why not call this *religious* history and relegate all exploitations of historical fact in the interest of group prejudices to the realm of the profane or the secular? Nothing that tampers with fact in ancient literature or in modern communiqués is sacred. It may seem expedient for the moment but cannot be abiding.

But more seriously. Dr. Wallis is a sociologist who has long been interested in the reconstruction of the story of Hebrew life and thought; yet it can scarcely be claimed that his knowledge of Semitic lore is profound, or that he is more than superficially acquainted with much of the source material. For instance, the abundant archæological activity in the Near East during recent decades that has brought to light so much that must be primary source material for the sociologist is all but ignored. Telling use has been made of three or four of the most publicized finds (cf. pp. 83, 135-138, 221), but a wealth of data recovered from ancient mounds that at least would have enriched the presentation—*e.g.,* ostraca from Taanach and Megiddo, dye vats and similar remains from Mirzim, the accumulated evidence of the prevalence of the fertility cult, the Ras Shamra tablets, and the discoveries in Nuzi—the significance of these and much else seems to be beyond the ken of the writer. In fact it is hard to avoid the conclusion, from this and the bibliography cited, that the research work for this volume was practically completed two, if not three, decades ago.

Many other questions arise. Did the Babylonian invasion of Judah "effect a mass movement to monotheism" (pp. 6, 231)? Was the Danite migration northward a piece of national, military strategy, and did it greatly alarm the Philistines (p. 81)? If so, unless Judges 5:27 was an ancient, misleading, official communiqué, those most interested were in the dark. Elijah, no doubt was one of the beacon lights of Old Testament history, but was he a champion of justice and righteousness (p. 165), or was he simply an anti-Tyrian, a fanatical proponent of Yahweh of the desert? Further, one wonders if too much stress has not been placed on the difference between *baal* and *adhôn.* True, philologically *baal* meant "owner," and had a commercial significance, while *adhôn* meant "master" and was used of personal relations. But does it follow that Baalism was essentially unjust, while those who used the word *adhôn* stood for a higher ethic? Or was this distinction between North and South—Baalism and injustice as against Yahwism and justice—so clear-cut as the author would have us believe? In critical studies root meanings must be understood. But we must also remember that through the centuries words changed their meaning; good words sometimes became corrupt, while evil words, at least occasionally grew into sainthood. Also it may be questioned, were

ancient writers always cognizant of the root meaning of their words, or did they always accurately hew to the philological line? Methinks that the sociologist has overemphasized a single technical fact in the interest of an important principle.

But enough; these are but flies in the ointment. Theoretically we enjoy the irritations, for they are the stimuli to further, careful study. Not all the problems of biblical history and religion are yet settled. This volume is helpful.

I. G. MATTHEWS

The Spiritual Life, by Edgar Sheffield Brightman, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942, pp. 218, $2.00.

Though advertised as "An Abingdon-Cokesbury Good Book," both in its intellectual and inspirational value this work ranks far above the simple books of edification and sermon material usually coming to us with that description. Dr. Brightman has felt impelled to undertake the important task of stating what is meant by "the spiritual life" and "spirit." He is aware of the vagueness with which these terms are so often used and the fact that they arouse "antipathies" among certain people. The chapters were given as lectures on the Cole Foundation at Vanderbilt University, and the language used for that purpose—sometimes somewhat rhetorical—is well adapted to a wide religious appeal. But, in my opinion, this form of exposition has meant some loss of clear systematic thinking such as we have always previously found in this author's writings. Nevertheless, considered as an account of "the spiritual life," the volume is one of the highest value for religious teachers, and not a few modern philosophers might learn something important from it.

The author's main purpose is to given a comprehensive description of "the spiritual life," and in doing this to show that it involves more than is implied in contemporary naturalistic and humanistic theories. It may be said that the holders of these theories to some extent share "the spiritual life" which points beyond them. "The spiritual life" is a life of reason, noble, courageous; a life of free activity directed to the realization of ideal values of all kinds—the true, the beautiful, the good, the holy. It is an affair of individual personal consciousnesses in social relations with other human persons and religious relations with the Divine Person. "Spiritual life in its best sense is the raising of man's purposes nearer to the level of divine purposes." He subjects to keen criticism and rejects the sociological concept of a "group mind" as a "fiction" ignoring fundamental aspects of the individual in "the spiritual life" and tending to the merely humanistic.

If the author had limited himself to an account of "the spiritual life," I should have had nothing but praise for his book. But he has also treated of the term "spirit," used substantively. Of this, his exposition appears vague, even confusing. This needs indication in detail, but the space allotted me here admits mention of only a few points. Though Dr. Brightman insists emphatically that "spirit" is personal, he does not make really clear the relative significance of the terms "mind," "person," "spirit." He has many descriptions of "spirit," supplementing one another, which tend to obscure the ontological question involved. "Spirit" is "*a field* of force," "*one's attitude* towards value," "*power,*" "courageous *experience,*" "*a movement of the mind* away from the lower levels of consciousness," and so on (italics mine). Though predominantly throughout the exposition of "the spiritual life" the term "spiritual" implies the good or ideal, "spirit may be good or evil." In fact, the author talks of "evil spirit" and "evil spirits." The two terms "unspiritual" and "nonspiritual" are not always carefully discriminated, and he does not clearly indicate their implication in a theory of the world according to which (as the preface and the book jacket tell us) "only spirit is truly real."

ALBAN G. WIDGERY

The Religious Availability of Whitehead's God, by Stephen Lee Ely, Madison (Wisc.), University of Wisconsin Press, 1942, pp. 58, $1.25.

The subtitle of this book is *A Critical Analysis.* The subtitle is admirably worded, for the book is just that. It begins with a brief presentation of Whitehead's early negative attitude toward theological questions, the notable turning point in his thought indicated in *Science and the Modern World* (especially in chap. 11), and the unexpected advance of theology in *Process and Reality.*

It would be hard to find elsewhere so concise and clear an exposition of the nature and place of God in the "Philosophy of Organism" as that which Professor Ely has here given us. It is no small thing to say what *Process and Reality* really means, and to expound the niceties and the vaguenesses of God's primordial nature and his consequent nature requires both a clear head and a courageous heart. Not only those who are interested in theology will find this little 58-page book valuable: purely philosophical students of Whitehead will also have reason to be grateful to Professor Ely.

The author's investigation of the more strictly theological problem does not turn out too well for the great philosopher. At any rate, whatever the logician may think of the Whiteheadean God, the religious availability of this new deity is, in Professor Ely's opinion, very slight. But more than this comes out in the course of our author's investigation. His very attempt to put Whitehead's position into words which shall be available for the man who reads only English (and not Whiteheadese) brings forceably to the reader's mind certain important philosophical queries. For example: Is it possible to express the more profound principles of the philosophy of organism with perfect clarity and at the same time keep them true to Whitehead? Is it possible to say whether the mental terms of this philosophy do or do not involve consciousness: does not such persuasiveness as much of the argument of "Organism" possesses derive from a systematic playing fast and loose with meanings? Can one really put "God's primordial nature" and "God's consequent nature" into one being: is there any sense in the assertion that together they *are* "God"? In short, when one sees clearly the foundations, in either reason or experience, on which Whitehead's conclusions are based, do they not look surprisingly shaky? Or might one rather ask whether some of Whitehead's more tremendous conclusions, when critically analysed, mean anything at all?

JAMES B. PRATT

Goals and Desires of Man, by Paul Schilder, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. xii, 305, $4.00.

The late Dr. Paul Schilder had a large psychiatric practice in the university clinic of Vienna and later in Bellevue Hospital, New York City. This book is a series of studies based on his experience and published after his death by a group of his medical associates.

To the layman who has no special competence in these matters the surprising quality in this book as in similar studies is its lack of critical quality. We live in an empirical and scientific age when a premium is placed on accurate observation and the strictest kind of testing. Yet a whole literature has arisen, taking the name of science to itself, which seems to the amateur to indulge in the wildest and most unchecked form of speculation. In this book, for example, the tall stories which patients tell appear to be taken at their face value with little or no allowance for the distortion in the patient's mind, his desire to show off, or his own inaccuracy in recollection. Reference is actually made in one place, for example, to the patient's memory of his experiences during the first year of his life.

Further, not only is the method of observation of fact highly questionable, but the interpretation placed on the facts is even more so and even less subject to critical tests. The interpretations placed on the so-called facts of experience make use of hypotheses which to the untutored amateur are nothing less than wild. There is a great deal of talk, for example, about narcissism, aggression, passivity, and the like, in such a way as to make the reader wonder whether a large amount of extraneous quality has not been read into a fairly simple situation. The talk of the delight the child has in showing destructiveness toward its mother, in opposing and then identifying itself with its father, in finding its parent as a rival, and the like, is talk which does not make sense unless one has grown up with psychoanalytic literature. The question is whether it makes sense—when taken with such literature as a background—because the literature has created a series of prejudices or because the literature has itself brought real insight into the facts of human nature. On this point the amateur obviously has no very valuable opinion. One can only say that a point of view does not commend itself for its judiciousness when it makes as much as does this one of the "body openings" and their significance, of the "similarity between money and feces," and of "cunnilinguistic" practices, to mention only a few of the more printable references.

Yet the fact remains, puzzling to the present reviewer, and obviously a fact with which he cannot himself deal constructively, that a large group of high-minded, scientifically trained, socially purposeful men and women find that this approach to the problems of life enable them to understand the mechanisms of human nature better and to provide healing measures for some of its more degraded and less healthy forms. Since these ideas actually help human beings, there must be some truth in them. The question is: how much truth and what kind? The present reviewer is inclined to believe that psychoanalysis is at present in its imaginative stage and that the critical period will perhaps come later. Certainly imagination runs riot on some of these pages under discussion. Perhaps that is necessary before the really arduous testing and critical process can begin.

J. S. BIXLER

Moses, by John W. Flight, Boston, Beacon Press, 1942, pp. xi, 146, $1.75.

A Guide for Teachers, by Edna L. Acheson, Boston, Beacon Press, 1942, pp. 48, $0.60.

Scholarship is happily combined with popular appeal in as accurate and as fascinating a portrait of Moses as we are likely to have for some time to come. The story is told for children with a simplicity and freshness rarely found in material written-down for younger minds; besides being interestingly written it shows the meticulous regard for detail which one would expect on the part of such an Old Testament scholar as Professor Flight, of Haverford College.

Some features of the book are especially noteworthy. The illustrations are carefully chosen from actual photographs of life in the desert, and from ancient and modern art. Numerous drawings by Dorothy Bayley show a fidelity to life in Egypt as we know it from the monuments. The tangled problem of documents for the sources of Moses' life is effectively explained for children in the introduction. At the end of each of the thirteen chapters there is printed the story as it is in Bible, material from the older sources; parts which seem to have been added by "the later generations of the great man's admiring followers" are omitted. The story of Moses is told not only by a discriminating use of the Old Testament material but against the broad background of life in ancient Egypt. Professor

Flight also makes use of the wealth of extra-biblical material dealing with Arabian life.

Critical problems have been relegated to the *Guide* where they are discussed frankly and fairly. Some of the subjects treated there are: the divine name Yahweh; "Was Moses a monotheist?" ancient, oriental parallels to the story of Moses' infancy; miraculous character of the plague stories; three possible routes of exodus; the original ten commandments; the character of the Passover. The attitude of the criticism applied to the problems connected with Moses is wholesome and positive. The folklore pattern to which the infancy story of Moses certainly belongs is cited, not to minimize the beauty of the particular story of Moses, but to enhance it in a larger setting.

This is material for religious education which will prove to be acceptable to technical scholarship as well as exceedingly helpful to the pupil and teacher. It contains ample material for a half-year of study; in fact one of its qualities as a text is its limitation to material which has been gathered about one biblical character. Perhaps this limitation of consideration for an extended time of material about one character of the Bible might prevent the moral indigestion which comes from the frequent practice of skipping blithesomely over the centuries in order to keep pace with a time schedule called "uniform lessons."

Old Testament scholars will congratulate Professor Flight and those who have helped him on doing a difficult task acceptably; teachers and parents will thank him for the helpful way in which he has pictured the Egyptian prince, the nomad sheikh, the lawgiver of the Old Testament.

JAMES B. PRITCHARD

This Seed of Faith, by Henry M. Battenhouse, New York, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942, pp. 192, $1.50.

Delivered in 1940 as a series of lectures at the School of Religion of the Metropolitan Methodist Church in Detroit, the chapters of this book seek to set forth our Christian faith in its fourfold aspect: "first, as religious experience; second, as Gospel legacy; third, as Christian theology; and fourth, as revelation in history" (p. 10). The chapters of the book deal with these various themes under such titles as "Stages in the Growth of Faith," "Four Approaches to the Christian Faith," "The Good News," and "The Church and the World." The treatment is frequently not so systematic and sustained as one might wish. Instead, it tends toward the impressionistic and homiletical. This weakness is recognized by Professor Battenhouse himself, for he writes in the Foreword: "I have not tried to write a theological treatise. The chapters are too informal for that, the courses of discussion too unpremeditated, the analyses too unexacting." As a result of this weakness the mature Christian will find the book altogether too flighty and unsatisfying. Many will long for stronger meat.

Taking his stand upon historical Christianity as the final step on the ladder of faith, Battenhouse contends that the life and death of Christ alone inaugurate "the one great and divine movement which gives to history, to life itself, and to the world a significance and a meaning" (p. 31). Here he stands, finding the meaning of existence in the historical unfolding of divinely disclosed truth. As a result of this point of view, he strongly emphasizes a doctrinal interpretation of Christianity. He finds, for instance, that the New Testament offers four approaches to the Christian faith. These are found in the incarnation, the atonement, the resurrection, and Pentecost. Nothing very fresh and vital is presented in the elaboration of these

doctrines. They are accepted largely as interpreted by historic Christianity. It is held that the truth of the first three doctrines is witnessed by the recurrence of the experience of Pentecost in us. The Holy Spirit speaks in us of God's truth in Christ, making it possible for us wholeheartedly to accept the historic Christian faith. Here there is a definite acceptance of the mystical and the tradition which will not prove congenial to all.

Great faith is expressed in the importance and mission of the Christian church. As the carrier of the ultimate truths about God and life, it represents the heavenly breaking through into the earthly. The church, accordingly, is not simply a group of people, but "the divine dispenser of the gospel" (p. 185). In it faith discovers its sanctuary. Within it faith need not despair, but can gain the assurance that God's purposes will finally prevail.

In conclusion, let it be said that this volume is characterized by an overtone of courage and good cheer. Admitting that these are evil days and bitter, the counsel given is not one of despair, but rather a challenge to faith and a fearless grappling with life. He who finds himself in despair and fear before the thrust of the world would do well to consider the ten practical inferences which Battenhouse draws from his study of the Christian faith and with which he closes his volume.

Not profound, nor too systematic, and certainly not too exhaustive, this impressionistic presentation of the Christian faith may yet be found valuable for lay reading and for use in a class in religion.

GEORGE W. DAVIS

Man Discovers God, by Sherwood Eddy, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. xiv, 270, $2.50.

This might be regarded as an attempt to do for religion what Eucken notably did for philosophy in his *Lebensanschauungen der grossen Denker.* In a popular sense, at least, Eddy has succeeded as well as the Jena professor did.

It is taken for granted that anyone may have faith in God—believe in him—but not knowledge of God, or even ideas of him; this must be left to those exceptionally rare spirits who have been endued with superlative brain, sanctity, and illumination, denied the rest of us. Their "findings" are revelation. The author's principle is "that divine revelation and human discovery [of God] are not contradictory or independent functions, but rather supplementary and correlative. . . . Thus progressive revelation is a combination of divine self-disclosure and human insights and experiences and achievements in experience."

At the outset one is curious to see who Eddy's Discoverers of God are. Jesus is properly kept in the background, as a sort of norm ("Those who have really discovered God do not ask for more light, or higher spiritual truth than we find in Jesus"). Yet the book starts off with Plato. (Plato's words, that are quoted, might well have been used as a title-page sentiment: "Go up, O Soul, to the vision of him who is—go up quietly, reasonably, willingly, fearlessly, lovingly.") Amos, Hosea, Jeremiah, and the Prophet of the Exile follow; then Paul and Saint Augustine. Saint Francis is grouped with Thomas à Kempis, Pascal, and George Fox. The Reformers considered are Luther, Bunyan, Wesley, and Jonathan Edwards. In a chapter, "The Scientists' Discovery of God," we have Isaac Newton, Pasteur, Michæl Pupin, and Arthur Compton. "The Modern Discovery of God" is devoted to Tolstoy, Booker Washington, Reinhold Niebuhr, Gandhi, Schweitzer, and—who do you suppose?—the late President Harper of the University of Chicago. A catholic selection, certainly!

One naturally would not ascribe to Sherwood Eddy a profound acquaintance

with the history and writings of all these more-or-less men of God; and indeed the book gives evidence of "reading-up"; be that as it may, the cramming has been very neatly done. The liberal point of view and the method of approach render the book popular, in a praiseworthy sense. It is more than a survey: a bundle of interpretations, rather. No matter how widely read you are in church history and the history of religions, you will find it great fun, and considerable profit, to go through these breezy pages. Eddy is an experienced bookmaker, and knows how to do it. For example, he wisely lets the Discoverers speak for themselves. This the ordinary reader will appreciate, for the most of us do not have on our shelves Luther's *Galatians,* the writings of Jonathan Edwards, the *Journal* of John Wesley, or even—the more's the pity!—Brother Lawrence's *The Practice of the Presence of God.*

The united testimony of such a notable group of wise men, some of them saints, is imposing; and telling—with many people. It is a book that should strengthen religious faith, and clarify the average man's vague, muddy thinking about God. For today, as scarcely ever before, the world sorely needs a strengthened, clarified faith in him.

MITCHELL BRONK

John Ponet (1516?-1556): Advocate of Limited Monarchy, by Winthrop S. Hudson, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1942, pp. ix, 246, 183, $4.50.

Our American John Adams mentioned John Ponet by name when he said of his *Shorte Treatise of Politicke Power* that it "contains all the essential principles of liberty which were afterwards dilated on by Sidney and Locke." The only other political theorist who had previously cited Ponet by name was William Prynne of Commonwealth England. The author of this careful study before us gives some plausible reasons for this apparent conspiracy of silence against a work which would seem to have been the deliverance of a pioneering mind. He believes that the treatise was quite influential in encouraging limited monarchy and even tyrannicide, but the author's due fame has been unfortunately smothered. The result is a well-documented account of his life and of the possible sources and the probable influences of this his most important work.

John Ponet was a member of the group of Cambridge Christian scholars who responded to the tonic and effervescent power of reformatory ideas from the Continent in the days of Henry VIII. We find him later a valued chaplain of Cranmer's, and then successively bishop of Rochester and Winchester in young King Edward's time. Then fell the blow of Mary Tudor's accession to the throne. Some of the reformers stayed; some fled. Many of those who fled later returned to give England her Puritan reformation. (Knappen's *Tudor Puritanism* is the valuable recent work on this whole era.) But Ponet was not to return. Strassburg, his Continental haven, was to shelter him for a few years of study and writing, and then to become the city of his death. He was hardly more than forty years of age. It was only his writing that perpetuated his influence, and, as we have indicated, that became deeply shrouded in anonymity. The man himself appears not to have left a notable mark, despite Dr. Hudson's laudable attempt to rescue him from the unkind aspersions of writers who have transmitted gossip uncritically from century to century. Hudson quotes occasionally from Ponet's crisp humor, and makes us wish for more.

The delightful surprise of the volume, however, is the facsimile of the 1556 edition (the first) of Ponet's work, taking up nearly half of the pages. With all due respect to the value of Hudson's own study, it must be said that this inclusion insures the

book a positive permanent value. The fifteen-page bibliography is good, and the indexing is well done. One may make a trivial complaint of the printing: the quoted material is given in almost the same type as the footnotes, so that the reader's moving eye sometimes travels unwittingly into the footnotes. (No serious objection: the footnotes are full of riches.)

Need we stress the relevance of a study like this in our day of quickened political living and thinking? Dr. Hudson may or may not have made a case for the importance of Ponet's influence. (I am not completely impressed.) We cannot refrain, however, from thanking him for the rescue of a deserving work and for the stimulation afforded by this fascinating chapter in the history of ideas. This is very significant: "When, in 1556, John Ponet published his *Shorte Treatise of Politicke Power,* he was the first person among the English Protestants, and, indeed, among the Reformed groups on the Continent as well, definitely to advocate resistance by the people to authoritarian government and to base this resistance upon constitutional principles" (p. 180). A few years later John Calvin, under the pressure of experience, modified his earlier injunctions to complete civil obedience. The gathering power of this type of thought was at length to cut off King Charles' head and to make of thirteen restless colonies a sovereign state.

JOHN WOOLMAN BRUSH

The History of Quakerism, by Elbert Russell, New York, Macmillan, 1942, pp. xxv, 586, $3.00.

Few writers of Quaker history have found it possible to attain impartiality and objectivity in their task. The very genius of this religious philosophy of life is its doctrine of the Inner Light and its sense of the mystical which tends to create a spirit of unreality, a feeling of unaccountability, save the divine, concerning its origins and records. Professor Russell, dean *emeritus* of the Divinity School, Duke University, has been able, more than most writers on Quakerism, to achieve the historical method.

We are in accord with the dean's statement that Quakerism "organically related to contemporary history" is "by its chronological position the final development of the English Reformation," and, "Throughout most of its history it has remained almost altogether within the English-speaking world." But he does not explain why he reaches this conclusion.

The English Reformation was political as well as religious. It was, in fact, the long and slow process of reform of all English custom and practice by which the individual gained freedom and independence in all affairs of life, political, economic, religious. The term *Reformation* in the history of England may be said to be synonymous with *democracy,* and the Friends represent the extreme in democratic development. Quite naturally, therefore, Quakerism found rootage only within the English-speaking world, for therein alone may be found a well-established democracy.

The history of Quakerism presents two main tendencies. The first is this emphasis upon democratic principles, the right of the individual. In seventeenth-century England the trend swept far beyond the Quaker position, giving rise to such groups as the Ranters, Diggers, Levelers, and Fifth Monarchy Men. These had their day and ceased to be, because they went beyond (as the Friends almost did) the sound old English respect for law, order, and the rights of private property. The Quakers, however, were not far behind in their lack of respect for constituted authority of church or state, refusing, as Fox said, "to bow the knee or scrape the leg to any man." Little wonder they were persecuted in almost every land wherein they sought to dwell.

It was this oppression and attempt at suppression that accounts for the other trend

of which Dean Russell speaks, but for which he does not adequately account—their quietism. For this characteristic is, in reality, an expression of the democratic spirit. Denied the exercise of their pure democracy by their fellow men, they turned inward upon themselves and found the full measure of their satisfaction in secret fellowship with God. Participation in the responsibilities of citizenship was disdained, so that in 1756, for instance, the Friends withdrew from the legislature of Pennsylvania.

No phase of Quaker history, of which all members of the Society may well be proud, has seemingly escaped the notice of the author, and, as has been indicated, his treatment is in general that of the detached historian. It is strange therefore that in the table of contents, as in the chapter heading itself (No. 22), we should find the dates 1927-1928 given for the Great Separation rather than those of the century preceding, 1827-1828.

R. E. E. HARKNESS

Evangelicals, Revolutionists and Idealists, by Francis John McConnell, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942, pp. 184, $1.50.

Drew University is to be congratulated for having a lectureship in biography, of which there are far too few, and also for securing so able a lecturer as Bishop McConnell to discuss the unique service rendered to America by such notable Englishmen as Oglethorpe, Wesley, Whitefield, Paine, Berkeley, and Wilberforce, whose influence, he feels, has not been sufficiently recognized.

The limits of a brief review do not permit the presentation in detail of the many excellencies of these six short biographies. They are unusually interesting and informing, and while they do not claim to give with completeness the history of the characters considered, they do keep in view the author's primary object, which is to show how they contributed to "American thought and action."

James Edward Oglethorpe is presented as having a rare combination of practical talents and philanthropic ideals. His Georgia colony was founded to provide a refuge and an opportunity for debtors in English prisons, but his interest was not limited to them. Although his utopian efforts did not produce permanent results, he acted upon principles without which imperialism now seems monstrous. "He held to the doctrine of imperial interdependence, with all members working together for the good of the whole—an anticipation of a commonwealth of nations on the one hand, and a moral trusteeship for backward peoples on the other."

On his second trip to Georgia, Oglethorpe took John Wesley with him. The latter stayed but two years, from 1735 to 1737. It has been said that his work was a failure. The writer does not agree with this, and shows how Wesley's experiences in Georgia gave him valuable training for his later leadership in the Methodist revival. As his great movement developed in England he sent preachers to America, among them Francis Asbury, who understood and was understood by Americans, and who led the movement so effectively that "the essentials of Methodist procedure and teaching," laid down by Wesley, gave direction to "a main stream of American religious life for generations to come."

George Whitefield arrived in Georgia to take John Wesley's place about the time the revival in Northampton, Mass., was beginning, under the leadership of Jonathan Edwards. When this revival began to wane, it was given new impetus by Whitefield. Edwards frightened his hearers by his relentless logic. "Whitefield served the Great Awakening by being a human being as well as a devoted evangelist." His Calvinism was tempered by "his humanity and his devotion to his fellowmen." His great contribution is shown to be the keeping of religion "close to human life in eighteenth century America."

The fascinating story of Thomas Paine is retold because of his relation to deism, which was an important religious philosophy in the middle eighteenth century. He came to America in 1775 at the suggestion of Benjamin Franklin. While here he made an important contribution to the cause of the Colonies by his writings. On his return to England he continued his pronouncements against privilege so vigorously that he was "declared an outlaw" and found refuge in France. While there he wrote *The Age of Reason,* which was used by the opponents of his social and political ideas as the chief weapon against him when he came back to America. His main contribution to American life was in support of democracy, for which he has not received due credit. His deism was rejected, and brought his name under a cloud which has never been completely dispelled.

George Berkeley is given a place among those who have made a significant contribution to America because of his system of idealism. He came to this country in 1729, planning to go on to Bermuda to establish the great university of which he had dreamed. His hopes were disappointed, but he used his three years' stay in Rhode Island to advantage by writing *Alciphron,* one of his best philosophical works.

Bishop McConnell is especially qualified to discuss the idealism of Berkeley because of his intimate and extended association with the late Borden Parker Bowne, an able exponent, interpreter, and critic of the earlier philosopher. The agreements and contrasts between these great thinkers are ably presented by the author, who ascribes to Berkeley the "immortal" merit of having "struck the deadly blow against materialism."

The author's purpose in discussing William Wilberforce is not only to show that the abolition of the English slave trade, brought about by his efforts, was a "deadly blow at American slavery," but to indicate that the problems which he faced "were of the same kind that always confronts the Christian statesman, and the Christian citizen, in any attempt to apply Christianity to large-scale social conditions."

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER

Getting down to Cases, Charles T. Holman, New York, Macmillan, 1942, pp. 207, $2.00.

Dr. Holman is professor of practical duties in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. He is widely known by virtue of two earlier books in this field: *The Cure of Souls* and *The Religion of a Healthy Mind.*

The present volume is characterized as "a case and method manual for personal counseling"; the major portion is devoted to actual case studies in illustration of counseling technique. The opening chapter, "The Pastor as Counselor," is a fine apologetic, and the final chapter sets forth the author's conception of the preparation needed by the pastor who would be a wise and helpful counselor.

Pastoral counseling, an ancient pastoral function, is coming into its own again. The new profession of the psychiatrist, as the word indicates, is the ancient role of the clergy in scientific garb. "While the minister should be careful not to assume the role of psychiatrist, he should not permit himself to be driven from his proper field of work." The medical profession may have the term, with our blessing, but we shall continue to minister to people in their "fears, worries, anxieties, feelings of inadequacy, and sense of sin." Referring to Dr. Carl G. Jung, one of the three pioneers in "depth" psychology, our author says, "He asserts that among all his patients who were past thirty-five years of age there has not been one whose problem, in the last resort, was not that of finding a religious outlook on life." The pastor,

therefore, may be sure that religion, wisely conceived, has the answer for the non-physical difficulties of his people; but it is incumbent upon him, and his seminary, to make adequate preparation for this ministry.

Many sciences, particularly the social and psychological sciences, continue to contribute to our understanding of the human personality—how it develops either into the normal or the abnormal, what makes for personality health, what for personality sickness. On the other hand, contemporary theological disciplines lay hold upon ever new insight in order to bring religion to bear most effectively in the growth of God's children. As counselor and educator the minister functions to prevent rather than to cure; hence he "will need a thorough grounding in the psychological and social sciences," and "he should be thoroughly informed with regard to the insights and techniques developed by such disciplines as social case work, mental hygiene and psychiatry, and educational and vocational counseling." Moreover "the ministerial student should have some opportunity for clinical experience" in social case-work agencies, child guidance clinics, hospitals, and almshouses, and above all he should have a thorough understanding of the "vast resources that are available in religious faith, fellowship, and practice for the development and rehabilitation of personality," and how all these may be employed wisely and effectively in his pastoral oversight and guidance.

Theological seminaries more and more will aim to equip the young minister to redeem the ancient function of pastoral counselor and "cure of souls," while for ministers already in the active work there will be an increasing number of books, conferences, and summer schools by means of which they may bring themselves up to date and increase their effectiveness. Dr. Holman concludes, "If ministers are to be prepared for such a function in dealing with individuals, they will need a far better training in those disciplines which give an understanding of human nature than has been given to them in the past."

W. R. MC NUTT

English Institute Annual, edited by Rudolf Kirk, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. xi, 248, $2.50.

The English Institute held its third session at Columbia University in September, 1941. From the program of lectures and conferences nine papers have been collected and edited for the *Institute Annual* of 1941; one from the section on "Literature and the Arts," one from the "Literary Criticism" group, and the remaining seven from the ten articles read before the Biographical section. Thus the weight of this edition of the *Annual* is thrown on the side of bibliography.

> ". . . bibliography may be defined as the systematic study of the transmission of the written word whether through manuscript or print, and it aims at the evolution of a critical organon by which the utmost possible results may be extracted from the available evidence" (quoted on p. 97).

To put it very briefly, bibliography is the study of the material transmission of literary texts. The seven papers on this theme are: "Quentin's Theory of Text Criticism," by J. Burke Severs; "An Evaluation of Evidence in Shakespearean Textual Criticism," by Madeleine Doran; "Principles of Historical Annotation in Critical Editions of Modern Texts," by Arthur Friedman; "The Problem of a Variorum Edition of Whitman's *Leaves of Grass*," by Sculley Bradley; "Evidence and Inference in Bibliography," by R. C. Bald; "The Headlines in Early Books," by Fredson Bowers; and "New Uses for Headlines as Bibliographical Evidence," by Charlton Hinman. The paper on literary criticism is "Wordsworth's *Ode: Intima-*

tions of Immortality," by Lionel Trilling. The paper on literature and the arts is "The Parallelism between Literature and the Arts," by René Wellek.

A criticism of each of these articles would produce a rather lengthy review; it is more pertinent to the present situation to summarize their character and conclusions. In the main, they present an attitude toward former work and conclusions in their field: they check this previous work of scholars and declare changes in theory and method that extend the usefulness of the method and the applicability of the theory. They are not—nor are they intended to be—startling new discoveries, but rather the careful and cautious extension of knowledge along lines already indicated.

Two exceptions ought to be noted. Dr. Trilling presents an important and significant new interpretation of the Wordsworth *Ode* that is much more sound than the commonly accepted position that made the poem a description of the poet's waning literary powers. The other exception is with reference to headlines.

The two papers on headlines are the work of two men who are doing excellent work in this field today. Their expert analyses of this single line in printed books gives us some new facts about the order of printing the formes of a book, about the priority of variant states, about the existence of hitherto undiscernible cancels, and about the probable size of an edition. One reads these particular papers with increasing awe and respect for the painstaking labor involved.

Madeleine Doran's paper on Shakespearean textual criticism, while it illustrates a special field, is a worthy and badly needed word of caution against a too quickly accepted conclusion based on merely one or two broad principles of examination. She reveals that constantly appearing force called "the human element" that has a way of upsetting scientific and natural principles of judgments and prediction.

In this present review a word must be said about the book and the student of religion. What is its meaning and value to him? (The temptation is to make the answer an article, rather than a review.) Let us say, briefly, the matter is one of at least six dangers to the minister:

1. Because no law courses are usually a part of a minister's education, he will profit by the distinction between evidence and inference.

2. Textual criticism is in danger of changing from a bludgeon in the hands of an ogrelike pedant into a fascinating, personal hobby. Indeed, the actual Bible he holds in his hand may become as fascinating and compelling an inspiration as any romantically conceived tables of stone or manuscript letter of an apostle.

3. It is highly probable he will learn the difference between *re*search and re*search*.

4. The discovery that all literature was written by human beings may result in the disturbing disclosures that men and women are interesting, too, and have a way of becoming an integral part of their work.

5. The cosy and confident assertion of what is "true" may become less satisfying than the cautious and careful proposal of "truth."

6. Ministerial reading of the present *Annual* may require larger subsequent editions.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

Motives for Christian Living, by William P. King, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. viii, 188, $1.50.

The title is fitting, for the book was written to give a lift to the countless Christians who long "to build above the deep intent the deed," or, as the author puts it in his foreword, "No human need is more urgent than to lay hold of the

moral incentive and spiritual power that will bridge the chasm between our knowledge and our conduct." Dr. King is well-qualified to undertake to meet this need because of his long experience as preacher, writer, and editor.

After paying his respects to conventional ethics by calling attention to a number of false emphases made by traditional morality and theology, the author develops his thesis in two parts: "The Ethical Ideals of Christianity" and "Motive Power for the Good Life." In the first part, the standards are set high, the supremacy of love is emphasized, and positive methods for overcoming evil stressed. In the second part, ethics is based upon "the threefold foundation, God, Freedom, and Immortality." Faith in these realities provides the soil from which springs self-regarding, altruistic, and Christ-devoted motives. "The supreme motive for good living" is suggested to be "in the being and character of God." Jesus is presented as "the perfect picture of God," the one in whom we have the full revelation of his Fatherhood. The final chapter of the book is devoted to the "motive of reward" which is presented as a "necessary postulate" to the Fatherhood of God, but construed in terms of the spiritual rather than of the material. "The good man's reward is to go on forever increasing in goodness."

In his foreword the author takes occasion to justify the touches of humor which enliven the pages of his work. These are introduced judiciously and serve well their purpose of illumination and emphasis. What could lay bare the barrenness of extreme Calvinism more plainly than the story of the aged Negro who was called upon to pray immediately after hearing a sermon on infant damnation, and who began his petition, "O thou great and unscrupulous God!" So the reference to a preacher who admitted that he "was proud of his sermon on humility," makes the reader smile, and at the same time reveals the subtle nature of the deadly sin of pride.

While it is not expected that every reader will agree entirely with the conclusions of the writer, all will acknowledge that he has made a real contribution toward the important end he had in view. The book is outstanding for its readability, good sense, and practical helpfulness.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER

BOOK NOTICES

What Man Cake Make of Man, by William Ernest Hocking, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. 62, $1.00.

In pleasant and perhaps intentional contrast to Mortimer J. Adler's thorny and dogmatic *What Man Has Made of Man* (1937), Ernest Hocking writes an urbane and beautiful essay on man's highest potentialities, enlarging his already famed *Fortune* article. Starting from the human situation in which man finds himself, Hocking shows how man achieves in science at once his greatest triumph and his greatest defeat; for the scientific dismissal of value meant that man had become meaningless. He reasserts those dismissed values and their "outside purchase," showing that the abandonment of a theistic rootage for values leaves man a victim of all-too-human "Leaders." His is a philosophy of commitment, not for the liberal who is "so very liberal that he cannot bring himself to take his own side in a quarrel." The tragedy of our civilization is the conflict between science and value or the subservience of science to false values. "Man's soul is recovering the sight of both eyes." This is a wholesome book, not to be easily dismissed.

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN

The Christian and the War, by Charles Clayton Morrison, Chicago, Willett, Clark, 1942, pp. v, 145, $1.50.

This is a reprint of editorials appearing in the *Christian Century* since December 7, 1941. Whether they have the permanent significance that this publication suggests is for the reader to decide. It would have been more interesting to some readers if Dr. Morrison's editorials on "The President's War" and "An Unnecessary Necessity" had been included, for, unless the editorials which preceded Pearl Harbor are known, the subsequent editorials can hardly be understood or their words properly weighed. Some who remember those earlier editorials wonder whether the present ratiocinations do not border on rationalizations. Dr. Morrison tried to get the Delaware Conference to use his slogan, "The Church Is Not at War," in its pronouncement. In the last editorial in this volume he writes: "The difference between the Christian militarist (*sic*) and the Christian pacifist is not substantial when viewed in terms of actual involvement in the war. Both are under the same necessity of supporting the war and, as we have previously made clear, do support it" (p. 132). Apparently there is some mystical difference between "the Church" and the people who make it up. In June, 1941, Dr. Morrison wrote of "the President's drive toward war." In this post-Pearl Harbor book he declares that the coming of the war is God's judgment upon us. Surely the supporter of Wendell Wilkie in the last campaign can't have confused God and the President! If the church is not at war, at least it may be remarked that wherever there is vital and vigorous Christian faith in Germany, Italy, or Japan the Christians hope for the defeat of the Axis. One of the differences between 1914 and 1942 is the number of great German Christian leaders who publicly declare this hope. And if "prayer is the soul's sincere desire," they are praying for that defeat. Much more might be said, but an editor always has the last word.

GORDON POTEAT

The Life of the Mind, by Emile Cailliet, New York, Macmillan, 1942, pp. ix, 79, $1.25.

This brief volume by a professor of Romance languages and literatures at the University of Pennsylvania is a challenge to students to return to thinking, which

is defined as "a process of clarification," from the emotional or passionate judgment which can lead only to error and prejudice. Thinking, however, cannot take place in a vacuum. That is to say, we cannot draw in upon ourselves, disclaiming the validity of all past racial and intellectual experience, and say we are going to think and arrive at valid judgments. On the contrary, clarification in us proceeds from a contemplation of the views of the great thinkers of the past. From this viewpoint, "truth is a form of faith." Once truth and faith in education are divorced in the student mind, a sense of frustration results. So Dr. Cailliet calls us back to the philosophers and poets of former ages—to Plato, Descartes, Pascal, Dante, and others—in order to effect our orientation in the modern age. Another emphasis lies in the warning that great living cannot be separated from God and religion. The huge crime bill, the rapidly increasing numbers of criminals in America, and the economic interpretation of history are all pointed out as indicative of the abandonment of faith. The moral degradation of our times is a positive corollary of the eclipse of religion from which true civilization draws "life, motion, and being." This book holds only scorn for those who would build a satisfying civilization apart from religious foundations. The author's estimate of the value of the Bible is registered when he writes towards the close of his treatise: "Our gratitude ever goes out to the reverent scholars and *men of God* who unfold to us the character and purpose of this record of facts." The chief value of this short volume lies in its stimulating thoughts sprinkled throughout its pages and also in its thesis that "true culture consists in taking stock of the past—in studying with intelligence and reverence the revelation handed down to us by the great servants of Truth."

GEORGE W. DAVIS

The Parables, with drawings by Cyrus LeRoy Baldridge, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. 44, with 8 four-colored plates and 20 pencil drawings, $2.50.

There have been many volumes devoted to the parables, but none quite like this one. There has been no attempt at criticism, analysis, or even introduction. The text is that of the King James Version, unaltered and unedited save in the matter of paragraphing and punctuation. Very wisely the introductions to the several parables are not printed. Thus every effort has been made to let the parables speak for themselves. In its format the volume is a delight. The large pages (twelve by nine), the large and clear type, the ample margins—all are well suited to the superb illustrations. Of the eight four-color plates two are double-page spreads. The artist is admirably fitted for this work. He knows and loves the country and the people he has portrayed. There is an undeniable strength, dignity, and reality in all his work. The Jesus and the other people of these pictures are not the idealized and sartorially perfect Anglo-Saxons of the stained glass windows. They are Orientals, and they are not decked out in costly and absurd garments and jewels. They look like the peasants of Palestine today. It is a hopeful sign that amid a world in flames artist and publishers alike so obviously believe that there are folks who will prize the opportunity of leafing through a volume which will lead them back to the land where these words were first spoken; who will find early memories refreshed, new insights kindled, as they read once more ancient words of profound understanding and of deathless beauty, as able today to challenge and to chide, to comfort and inspire, as they were when first uttered nearly two millennia ago; and who will find in the illustrations which have come from a long attachment to the land and its message a fresh aid to understanding the words of one who, like the householder he is said to have spoken of, brought forth out of his treasure things new and old.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

John Hus and the Czech Reform, by Matthew Spinka, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1942, pp. vii, 81, $1.50.

Dr. Spinka confirms the ancient adage: "There is nothing new under the sun." No man is wholly original. What he is and says is the product in some degree of what has gone before. He is in the stream of evolution. John Hus of Bohemia was indebted to John Wyclif of England. He made use of many of the sermons and other writings of the latter. This has always been known by historians of Christianity. But this is not sufficient for Dr. Spinka. With comprehensive investigation and careful analysis he presents the extent of that indebtedness. Unquestionably Hus did make use of some of Wyclif's works and even expressed himself at times in the latter's thought forms. Yet Hus carefully discriminated in his choice of his predecessor's doctrines and cannot be charged with plagiarism to any greater degree than may most authors of his day. Whatever he may have borrowed he transformed into the structure of the Czech religious order and adapted to the peculiar heritage and needs of his own people. Hus' measure of independence is recognized in the fact that, though he came to his trial accused of accepting all of the doctrines of the great Englishman, there before his judges he categorically rejected thirty-three of the forty-five articles of Wyclif which had been previously condemned as heretical. Of three of these remaining twelve he declared "he neither affirmed nor denied" their theses. Concerning the other nine, he carefully explained how they might be understood as orthodox and in what sense he would be willing to hold them. This little book, thorough in examination of evidence, restrained in expression, and balanced in judgment, is the product of fine scholarship. The author is himself a member of that race which gave birth not only to John Hus but to many other great prophetic souls within the Christian fold.

R. E. E. HARKNESS

They Made him Christ, by Walter P. Bradley, Boston, Christopher Publishing House, 1942, pp. 384, $3.50.

This is a difficult book to review or even to appraise. It would be easy to dismiss it as the work of an amateur—as it obviously is. Despite the fact that thirty years ago Dr. Bradley was one of the country's most influential instructors—a remarkably effective teacher and a man eminent in chemical research—that following his academic career he was engaged, until his retirement now some years since, in an equally successful career in industrial chemistry—despite all this, and the fact that in a comparatively limited area he has read a considerable amount and thought much and sensibly, he *is* an amateur in the field with which he is here concerned. It would also be possible to say that the fact that throughout this volume he has not referred to the work of any other investigator suggests a certain fascination for his own ideas. All of this is probably true, but it is not the whole truth: the book is more than this. There are crudities to the experienced eye; for example, once again we discover the almost naïve note that always characterizes this sort of volume: Remove the miraculous from the miracle stories, pull out the "wedges" which have been driven into the pregospel tradition, remove the "lattice" which Mark and his successors used to cover earlier less acceptable views, and you find sheer historical fact. Do you? I doubt it. The story is not so simple as that. Thus materials which the author uses with apparent confidence, as he discovers an original story before it had been transformed so as "to make him Christ" or to make him "a light to enlighten the gentiles," will seem highly suspect to many other investigators, who will smile as they remember stormy old Dr. Paulus. But the book has real values. Not, I fancy, for the pro-

fessional historian or critic. It was not written for them. But for the rank and file layman who is weary of the nonsense talked about the Bible, but who finds the average book by the professional—even if it was directed at him—"deep stuff," this book may well be of value. It is very readable, racy, in fact, at times; at times it is almost over-clear. For example, it is really a pity that he published the three-page summary at the end; the somewhat less clear-cut picture of the development of the early Christian thinking was more impressive than when summarized into several chronologically connected steps, some of which, at least, appear to me far from solid. For the most part I agree with his answers, but I find myself frequently in doubt at the legitimacy of his equations! The last chapter is devoted to the "Values" which remain when a man gives up his belief that Christianity is a divine product, fabricated in heaven, and let down to earth intact. It is worth re-reading by any man. To me it made very clear why one of his old students could say to me: "I remember Professor Bradley as one of my best college teachers. Advice and suggestions he gave me decades ago still remain in my mind as stimulating experiences."

MORTON S. ENSLIN

It Can Happen between Sundays, by Eugene Dinsmore Dolloff, Philadelphia, Judson Press, 1942, pp. 111, $1.00.

Here is another handbook on streamlining the admittedly decrepit midweek service. The author demonstrates his great resourcefulness at promotional planning, and freely shares his strategy with his less successful colleagues of the cloth in the fond hope that they too may bring about a boom in their attendance statistics. The material presented is unquestionably of practical value to those who naïvely agree that the neglect of the prayer meeting by modern churchmen is solely due to lack of enterprise on the part of the parson. Essentially the plan of Dr. Dolloff is based on the frank admission that the church has failed to draw large numbers to the midweek service because it has not entered into real competition with those other attractions which enjoy public endorsement. In order to qualify for such competition the emphasis must be swung away from the more serious objectives of the now outmoded prayer meeting, and should high-light such features as appeal to the ego and make for a general jollification. The price of admission to this "Glad Service" may be advertised as "A Smile." Little tricks of showmanship can be employed to make the throng sing lustily the hymns they have nominated in competition, and an abundance of prayers can be provoked by pitting the members of one church organization against those of another. Such modern diversions as quiz programs, true-or-false contests, *et cetera,* will add zest to the meeting and further good fellowship. "Go-getter" parsons will do well to study this book as a guide to numerical and popular success in the conduct of the "Glad Service." However, those pastors who cannot bring themselves to the employment of service-club methods, will find scant comfort from their perplexity over the midweek service.

MILTON C. WESTPHAL

The Lambeth Conferences, William R. Curtis, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. 355, $4.00.

A valuable contribution of this study is the light it sheds on the formation of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Twenty years before the first Colonial Conference was held, which considered the structure of this unique political organization, the first Lambeth Conference had met to confer on measures to promote the welfare of the Anglican Communion. The product resulting from each of these gatherings for consultation provides an excellent example of British methods: "Therefore," states the

author, "it is hoped that this study of its [the Anglican Communion] organization may have value for students of politics as well as for those whose concern is with the organization of religion." The first conference of the Episcopate, held in 1867, was an experiment in English ecclesiastical procedure. The initial steps toward convening it were taken by the church in Canada which proposed that a "national synod" be held "under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury as a means of enabling the other members of the Anglican Communion to have 'a share in the deliberations for the welfare of the church.'" In the face of strong opposition from the Convocation of York and of prominent English prelates and clergy, the archbishop convened the conference at Lambeth. The fact that the suggestion came from the Dominion of Canada has a parallel in the calling of the political assemblies of representatives of all the Dominions to consider their closer bond. So successful and valuable did this first conference of 1867 prove to be, that it was decided to hold others, seven in all, the gatherings occurring within ten years as events permitted. The first World War postponed the sixth until 1920 and the eighth, planned for 1940, was made impossible by the outbreak of the second conflict. This well-documented study of British institutions, most interestingly told, gives knowledge not alone of the spirit and practices of a world-wide church but also insight into the British method of progress by constitutional evolution rather than by swift revolution. Dr. Curtis is assistant professor of general history in New York University. His interest in this present subject grew out of his studies in constitutional and imperial history of England.

R. E. E. HARKNESS

A Basis for the Peace to Come, by Francis J. McConnell and others, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942, pp. 152, $1.00.

This volume is composed of the six Merrick-McDowell lectures at Ohio Wesleyan University, which provided something of a background for the conference at that school in March, 1942, on "A Just and Durable Peace," under the auspices of a commission of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. The six interesting and helpful lectures and the speakers were as follows: "The Church Must Face It!" Francis J. McConnell, bishop of the Methodist Episcopal church; "Toward a World Order," John Foster Dulles, international lawyer; "The Ecumenical Church and World Order," William Patton, of London, secretary of the Provisional Committee of the World Council of Churches; "The Problem of Economic Peace," Leo Pasvolsky, a special Russian assistant to the Secretary of State; "Factors Necessary for a Durable Peace in the Pacific Area," Hu Shih, then Chinese ambassador to the United States; "Problems of World Organization," Carl J. Hambro, president of the Assembly of the League of Nations.

JAMES H. FRANKLIN

The Shorter Moffatt Bible, New York, Harper, no date, pp. xvi, 327, $2.00.

When the first volume of Moffatt's *Old Testament* appeared in 1924, its reviewer in the CROZER QUARTERLY (July, 1925, pp. 223-232) anticipated a storm of protest from some quarters because of the bold departure from the language of the Authorized Version; but he ventured the prediction that Moffatt's translation would ultimately have an appreciative and general acceptance. Now, eighteen years afterwards, a pocket-sized, reader's edition of well-chosen selections from the Moffatt Bible has appeared. This venture of the publisher is evidence of the increasing acceptance of the Bible in the vernacular of the twentieth century. The tendency to keep up with the changing times is noted in one of the aims stated in the introduc-

tion: "Whilst not designed exclusively for their use, the men in the services have been kept in mind during its preparation." In an excellent table of contents, giving brief headings to the selections chosen for the collection, one finds an alertness on the part of the editor to contemporary life. There appears "A Selected Army" for Judges 7: 1-8, "The Unseen Allies" for II Kings 6: 8-17. The headings for the selections are of a historical or factual nature, without the theological tinge which so often mars the general usefulness of such an edition of biblical selections. This compact, inexpensive edition of selections from the best of an outstanding translation of the Bible is worthy of the space it takes in a knapsack, brief case, pocket, or beside a favorite easy chair. It is a more solid and perhaps a more helpful book than many of the more pious devotional books for sailors and soldiers now for sale either with blue or khaki cover.

JAMES B. PRITCHARD

The United Nations of the World, by Haridas T. Muzumdar, New York, Universal Publishing, 1942, pp. xvi, 288, $2.50.

In the present war the United Nations presumably represent the democratic ideal as over against the totalitarian, and their struggle against aggression is motivated by a hope of world democracy. Most of the planning as far as we are concerned is predominantly Anglo-American, and it is easy for us to forget our Asian allies. If there is to be a better world, Asia must play a mighty part in the future. The great bodies of colored peoples are struggling for freedom and democracy for themselves, and the white man's relation to this struggle, despite his slogans, is not as cordial as it should be. Dr. Muzumdar is a Hindu scholar and sociologist, born in India and educated in the United States. He is a believer in American democracy:

> The American scene is not without its dark spots. The ugliness and shortcomings are, however, excrescences upon the American way of life which is rooted in fair play, which is nurtured by education, which thrives on liberty, which blossoms forth in democracy, which in turn bears fruit in fair play. The existence of such a world is inconceivable to the European or the Asian.

He wants Americans to play their responsible part in achieving a world federal system with the abolition of empire and he makes a strong plea in this book to that end.

GORDON POTEAT

The Art of Dying Well, by Mary Catharine O'Connor, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. xiii, 258, $2.50.

Caxton, when he selected books for the Westminster Press, chose those which would help in the development of the "compleat gentleman." Included, therefore, were several books of codified manners, books which instructed one in all of the graces of the Middle Ages—"from manipulating a table knife to conducting a conversation; from the art of weeping to the art of playing chess." Among his books was one, the *Ars Moriendi,* or, as it was called in English, *Arte and Crafte to Knowe Well to Dye.* The present volume is the first competent study by an American of this book which evolved from chapters on how to die from the various compendia of faith in the thirteenth century to become a most popular volume in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries. The author has done a commendable and thorough piece of work in tracing sources and authorship, comparing versions, listing manuscripts, discussing the various editions, and describing later books in the *Ars Moriendi* tradition. There are interesting illustrations, and an excellent bibliography and index which could serve as a fine example for all pieces of graduate study. This volume should be

included in any study of historical devotional works, general mediæval culture, religious art, or literature of the early Renaissance. Incidentally, the art of dying is not a doleful subject, but quite a lively and enjoyable one as it was presented in its traditional form during mediæval days.

CHARLES E. BATTEN

Report on the League of Nations, 1941-1942, by the Acting Secretary-General, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. 94, $0.50.

This small volume deserves a review of some length if its real value is to be appreciated. It dissipates a commonly held view that the League of Nations is dead, or is dying, since it was unable to prevent the outbreak of a second world war. It reveals how, in spite of the grave difficulties encountered and a greatly reduced financial report since 1939, several agencies of the League have pressed on steadily in their research work in the areas in which international conflicts frequently germinate. There is a frank recognition that as an active political power the League has been practically nonexistent for several years. It shows, however, that the League continues as a centre of economic, financial, social, and humanitarian study and activity. Attention is called to the continuing International Labour Office, the Permanent Court of International Justice, studies in agricultural production and international currency problems, public health efforts in various countries, control of the drug traffic, the moral protection of women and children, international assistance to refugees, protection of minorities, and other problems. The volume also reveals that the various organizations of the League continue to exist, ready to resume large responsibilities in world reconstruction whenever a new order can be created.

JAMES H. FRANKLIN

Concerning Juvenile Delinquency, by Henry W. Thurston, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. x, 236, $2.75.

Part I presents a collection of cases of juvenile delinquency "from mischief to murder" and a discussion of the causes of such delinquency, in which the opinions of a large number of investigators are compared. Part II gives a history of the court treatment of juvenile delinquency, from "before 1840" down to the juvenile courts of the present. The last chapter of this section bears the title "The Juvenile Court at the Bar." The final sections survey nonlegal agencies which are concerned with the problem. Mr. Thurston writes not simply as a professional social worker, but from a deeply religious concern for the boys and girls who fail to realize their true destinies. This is a book which the parish minister might well have at hand.

GORDON POTEAT

War Without Inflation, by George Katona, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. x, 213, $2.50.

The author of this book, who is both an economist and a psychologist, makes a strong case for a rational approach to citizens in addition to any legal actions which are taken to prevent inflation. The whys and wherefores need to be publicly proclaimed, in order that the responses of the people to legislation may not be blindly emotional. It is shown by cases how much more effective this method is than the "keep-the-public-in-the-dark" and "put-teeth-in-the-law" method is. Let us hope that the book is read by some of those who are in authority.

GORDON POTEAT

BOOKS RECEIVED

Snowden's Sunday School Lessons, 1943, by Earl L. Douglass, New York, Macmillan, 1942, pp. xiv, 388, $1.50.

This well-known series of *Practical Expositions of the International Sunday School Lessons* has been available for workers in the church school for more than twenty years.

A Primer for Teachers, by Margaret Slattery, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. 141, $1.25.

Ten studies in methods and goals of religious education by a well-known teacher and writer.

Messages on Prayer, by B. H. Carroll, Nashville, Broadman, 1942, pp. 167, $1.50.

Eleven sermons by the founder of the Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Forty Sermon Studies from the Book of Jonah, by E. P. Alldredge, Nashville, Broadman, 1942, pp. 132, $1.00.

In the introduction Dr. Sampey remarks: "It might be safer for most preachers to limit themselves to ten sermons on the book of Jonah." With this observation we quite agree, with the possible exception of the word "most."

Anthology with Comments, by Elizabeth Janet Gray, Wallingford (Pa.), Pendle Hill Pamphlet 18, 1942, pp. 60, $0.25.

**Philosophy for the Millions,* by J. A. McWilliams, New York, Macmillan, 1942, pp. vii, 206, $2.00.

**Where Are the People?* by Sidney W. Powell, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942, pp. 223, $1.75.

**Invitation to Pilgrimage,* by John Baillie, New York, Scribner, 1942, pp. 134, $1.50.

**Society under Analysis,* edited by Elmer Pendell, Lancaster (Pa.), Jaques Cattell, 1942, pp. viii, 711, $4.00.

**The Tutelo Spirit Adoption Ceremony,* by Frank G. Speck, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania Historical Commission, 1942, pp. xix, 125, $0.75.

**Redemption and Revelation,* by H. Wheeler Robinson, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. xlviii, 320, $3.00.

**A History of Social Thought,* by Paul Hanly Furfey, New York, Macmillan, 1942, pp. xiii, 468, $2.75.

**The Subnormal Adolescent Girl,* by Theodore M. Abel and Elaine F. Kinder, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. xiii, 215, $2.50.

**Peace Now and Forever,* by Max Molyneux, Superior (Wisc.), Silver-Tonsberg, 1942, pp. xii, 162, $1.50.

**Who Crucified Jesus?* by Solomon Zeitlin, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. xv, 240, $2.50.

**The Social Background of the Old Testament,* by David Jacobson, Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College Press, 1942, pp. xi, 327, $2.00.

**Mind: Perception and Thought in Their Constructive Aspects,* by Paul Schilder, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. 432, $5.00.

**A Realistic Philosophy of Religion,* by A. Campbell Garnett, Chicago, Willett, Clark, 1942, pp. xii, 331, $3.00.

**Marcion and the New Testament,* by John Knox, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1942, pp. ix, 195, $2.00.

**Our Eternal Contemporary,* by Walter Marshall Horton, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. xx, 180, $2.00.

**Then and Now,* by John Foster, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. xii, 182, $1.75.

**The Role of Conjuring in Saulteaux Society,* by A. Irving Hallowell, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1942, pp. xiv, 96, $1.25.

**Christian Symbolism in the Evangelical Churches,* by Thomas Albert Stafford, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942, pp. 176, $2.00.

**Greek Foundations of Traditional Logic,* by Ernst Kapp, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. ix, 95, $1.50.

St. Mark's Gospel, by M. D. R. Willink, New York, Macmillan, 1942, pp. vii, 56, $0.75.

A very slight book.

Christian Belief, by R. H. Malden, New York, Macmillan, 1942, pp. vii, 88, $0.90.

A short exposition of the Apostles' Creed, intended as a "textbook on the faith for use in school and elsewhere."

Bombs, Buildings and Shelters, by William H. Hayes, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. 83, $0.60 (paper).

A convenient illustrated booklet by a professor of architecture, which will answer many questions being propounded today.

**Myths and Tales of the Chiricahua Apache Indians,* by Morris Edward Opler, Philadelphia, American Folklore Society, 1942, pp. xiv, 114, $2.50.

About Ourselves, by James G. Needham, Lancaster (Pa.), Jacques Cattell Press, 1941, pp. xi, 276, $3.00.

The emeritus professor of entomology at Cornell University in association with an artist, Mr. William D. Sargent, in a beautifully printed book presents in simple and popular form the story of man from the zoological standpoint. The biological development of man is discussed in the first part and societal development in the second.

**Guide for the Study of American Social Problems,* compiled for the American Social Problems Committee, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. vii, 181, $1.00.

* To be reviewed.